THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH AND PUBLIC POLICY

by

Byron Lee Schmid

Department of Political Science
Duke University

April 10, 1970

Richard Leach

Peter G. Fish

Hugh M. Hall

Creighton Lacy

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in the Department of Political
Science in the Graduate School of
Arts and Sciences of Duke University

1970

THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH AND PUBLIC POLICY

by

Byron Lee Schmid

Department of Political Science
Duke University

Date: April 10, 1970

Approved:

Richard H Leach
Richard H. Leach, Supervisor

Hugh M. Hall

Peter G Fish

Creighton Lacy

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Political
Science in the Graduate School of Arts and
Sciences of Duke University

1970

Archives
Ph.D.
S348A
1970

ABSTRACT

This study seeks to examine how the American Lutheran Church at the national level understands and exercises its political responsibility. The study considers the process by which the ALC arrives at its social policies, the attitudes of the ALC toward the forms and methods which it considers appropriate for the church in political action, and the political thought contained in its positions on public policy questions. It focuses on the activity of the ALC with respect to political action and to the political realism of its social policies and action.

In this study "political action" refers to those efforts to participate in the formation of public policy. Lobbying, or attempts to influence government officials, is one form of political action. "Political realism" refers to the sophistication of the ALC's understanding of the American political process and its willingness to engage in those types of activities which are necessary if the church desires to participate effectively in the political process.

The thesis of the study is that inasmuch as any national religious organization must engage in political action in order to be relevant politically, the American Lutheran Church evidences on the basis of its political thought and action a low degree of political realism in spite of a gradually developing consciousness of responsibility for the social order, a consciousness which includes the intent to be relevant politically.

Introductory chapters describe the public policy-making process in American society, noting especially the role of interest groups, including churches, in that process; outline Luther's political thought and consider the significance of the development of Lutheranism with respect to political responsibility; and trace the emerging social and political consciousness in American Lutheranism prior to 1960, the beginning of the current study.

The primary research methods used in the study are an examination of published and unpublished documents of the ALC and interviews. The writer's two and one-half years' staff experience with the ALC's Commission on Research and Social Action also has been an important ingredient in the study.

The study shows that the American Lutheran Church today has rejected Lutheran "quietism," or a concern for the inner quality of life to the neglect of concern for the social order. Civic responsibility is accepted as a part of the church's regular work. But the avenue by which the ALC expresses its social responsibility is largely through "social education," or educational and moral persuasion leading to individual rather than corporate action. The church has made only cautious overtures to "social action," or direct corporate efforts to change social, economic, and political conditions. It has made very

few attempts to influence public policy directly. Lobbying is rejected as a method of political influence.

The ALC's low degree of political realism stems from its primary reliance upon moral appeals as the key to political change. The church generally disavows its corporate responsibility in bringing about adjustments in the distribution of power leading to social and political change. The movement toward more effective political action has been retarded by an absence of social ethicists in the development of the church's social thinking, by a misinterpretation of the meaning of the theological principle of the "two kingdoms," and by inadequate planning and coordinating leadership in the church.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to those pastors and laymen in the American Lutheran Church who seek more creative and relevant political and social involvement for their church.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express appreciation to those persons whose assistance has enabled me to undertake this project. I am grateful to Dr. Richard H. Leach for his supervision of the study, especially his counsel on the development of the research methodology and in the improvement of textual clarity. I also am grateful to my colleagues in the national offices of the American Lutheran Church who helped sharpen my understanding of the church's political role, especially Dr. Carl F. Reuss who constantly emphasized the importance of careful research and analysis.

Appreciation also is due to the ALC's Commission on Research and Social Action which granted me a six-month leave of absence with salary in order to complete the dissertation. The Commission's interest in the study and encouragement to complete the project were additional incentives for completion at this time. I also am indebted to Dr. Reuss, Dr. Lloyd Svendsbye, the Rev. Kenneth Alpers, and the Rev. Wilfred Bockelman for their helpful criticism of the manuscript prior to final revision. Their comments provided a reality check upon the facts and interpretation of the materials in the study.

Finally I want to express appreciation to my wife and family for their patience and understanding during the course of the study. Their graceful acceptance of long periods of solitude evoke my deepest appreciation.

bls

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT i

PREFACE v

I. INTRODUCTION 2

- Context of the Study
- Statement of Purpose
- Other Considerations of the Study
- An Orientation to the American Lutheran Church

II. AMERICAN CHURCHES AND PUBLIC POLICY 14

- The Development of Political Realism in the Churches
- The Public Policy-Making Process
- Private Interest Groups and Lobbying Activity
- Churches and Political Action

III. GOVERNMENT AND POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY IN THE LUTHERAN TRADITION 55

- Luther's Political Thought
- Political Responsibility in the Development of Lutheranism
- A Contemporary Evaluation

IV. SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN AMERICAN LU[illegible]ANISM PRIOR TO 1960, WITH SPECIAL REFE[illegible]CE TO THE PREDECESSORS OF THE AMERICA[illegible]UTHERAN CHURCH 88

- "Quietism" in American Lutheranism
- Social Awakening Through Inter-Lutheran Cooperation
- The United Lutheran Church in America and the Augustana Lutheran Church
- The Evangelical Lutheran Church

The United Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Free Church

V. THE POLITICAL ROLE OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH 125

A Limited Political Role
The Limited Role Exemplified
The Struggle for Political Effectiveness
The Present Quandary of the ALC

VI. SOCIAL CONCERNS AND PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES IN THE ALC 170

The Commission on Research and Social Action
Church Council, Joint Council, and General Conventions
The President of the Church
Division of Youth Activity
Division of College Education
Periodicals of the Church
Social Issues in the ALC

VII. THE ALC AND THE NATIONAL CRISIS IN RACE RELATIONS 212

Background to Action
The Letter from Detroit
Project Summer Hope
The Inner City Organizes
"Decision in a Time of National Crisis"
"Christ for Crisis: Hope for All Seasons"
The ALC Today
The ALC, the National Crisis, and Public Policy

VIII. THE USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF ALC SOCIAL POLICY STATEMENTS 256

The Status of ALC Social Policy Statements
Functions of ALC Social Policy Statements
The Development of ALC Social Policy Statements
The Use of ALC Social Policy Statements, With Special Reference to Public Officials

IX. POLITICAL THOUGHT IN ALC SOCIAL POLICY STATEMENTS 281

Citizenship and Political Rights
Family Life and Health
Church-State Relations
Race Relations
Political Thought in the ALC

XUM

X. THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH AND PUBLIC POLICY 331

APPENDIX 342

TABLE 1: SOCIAL POLICY STATEMENTS OF THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH, 1960-1969 342

TABLE 2: EDITORIALS AND FEATURE ARTICLES ON SOCIAL ISSUES APPEARING IN *THE LUTHERAN STANDARD*, 1961-1969 354

BIBLIOGRAPHY 356

THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH AND PUBLIC POLICY

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Context of the Study

The history of American church-state relations reveals that religious organizations have been concerned with questions of public policy ever since the settlement of the colonies.[1] Interaction between the churches and the institutions of government has been a constant feature of national life. The relationship has been mutually advantageous at times, sometimes strained, and other times to the relative advantage of one at the expense of the other.

---

[1] The most comprehensive study of American church-state relations is the three volume edition by Anson Phelps Stokes, *Church and State in the United States* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950). A revised and updated edition of the Stokes' effort is Anson Phelps Stokes and Leo Pfeffer, *Church and State in the United States* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964). A constitutionally oriented treatment is provided in Leo Pfeffer, *Church, State and Freedom*, rev. ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967). Briefer descriptions of the interaction between religion and politics are Alan Geyer, *Piety and Politics* (Richmond: Knox Press, 1963) and Murray Stedman, Jr., *Religion and Politics in America* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1964).

XUM

But the patterns of American religious and political life bear the imprint of this long and dynamic relationship.[1]

However, two sharply divergent attitudes toward the relationship of church and state have characterized the Protestant denominations in the United States.[2] Both attitudes are reflected in most major denominations. On the one hand is separationism which posits a "wall of separation" between the religious and political institutions as a guarantee of the integrity of both institutions. Separationism has generally accepted the leadership of government in political, social, and economic issues, frequently sanctioning social changes already accomplished. This stance rejects the exercise of direct influence upon the state by the church. Separationism emphasizes the conversion of individuals and their individual responsibility to influence society and politics.

Transformationism, on the other hand, refuses to interpret the American pattern of church-state relations in any absolute sense. Rather it underscores the independence of church and state. Like separationism, transformationism affirms the autonomous functioning of church and state as a guarantee of the integrity of both institutions. But transformationism recognizes the prophetic principle of the churches and emphasizes the moral influence of the corporate church upon the state.

---

[1] Geyer, op. cit., provides a helpful consideration of this topic with respect to the area of foreign policy. He traces the role of religion in a six-fold scheme: as a source of loyalty, as a sanction for political loyalty, as a sanction for political conflict, as a source of political conflict, as a sanctuary from political conflict, and as a reconciler of political conflict.

[2] Cf. Thomas Sanders, Protestant Concepts of Church and State (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1964), especially pp. 19-24.

Until recently, Lutheran churches in this country have tended to reflect the separationist attitude. For the most part, a broadening Lutheran awareness of corporate responsibility for the public life of the nation traces back only to the Second World War. While the emergence of social consciousness has proceeded at a different rate in each Lutheran church, Lutheranism in America has been gradually adopting a transformationist attitude as regular participants in the development of public policy.

The emerging social awareness of American Lutheran churches has been described and analyzed in a number of studies. In 1941 Albert Geisler in "Official Pronouncements of the United Lutheran Church in America Relating to Certain Moral and Social Problems" examined the official statements of the three predecessor bodies of the United Lutheran Church in America.[1] In "History of the Social Gospel in the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in America, 1867-1918," Harold Lentz in 1943 described the relationship of the General Synod to the Social Gospel Movement.[2] More recently in 1953 Harold Haas outlined

---

1. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1941.

2. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Yale University, 1943.

the development of social awareness in the United Lutheran Church in America in "The Social Thinking of the United Lutheran Church in America, 1918-1948."[1] The three-volume "Christian Social Responsibility" series, produced by the United Lutheran Church in America in 1957, is the most comprehensive effort to date to articulate the social responsibility of American Lutherans.[2] The social consciousness of the Augustana Lutheran Church was analyzed by Robert Anderson in 1959 in "The Awakening Social Consciousness of the American Lutheran Churches in America Since World War I: With Special Reference to the Augustana Lutheran Church."[3] Finally, in 1966 Lloyd Svendsbye produced an analysis and comparison of the emerging social consciousness in four Lutheran church bodies. His study, as complete as the title, was "The History of a Developing Social Responsibility Among Lutherans in America From 1930 to 1960, With Reference to the American Lutheran Church, the Augustana Lutheran Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Lutheran Church in America."[4] None of these studies, however, focused on the political realism or the political action of the churches, the objective of the present study.

---

1. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Drew Theological Seminary of Drew University, 1953.

2. Harold C. Letts, ed., Existence Today, vol. I; The Lutheran Heritage, vol. II; and Life in Community, vol. III (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957).

3. Unpublished S.T.M. thesis, Union Theological Seminary, 1959.

4. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1966.

Statement of Purpose

The current study seeks to examine how the American Lutheran Church[1] understands and exercises its political responsibility. The study focuses on the activity of the American Lutheran Church with respect to political action and to the political realism of its social policies and action. It portrays the efforts of the ALC to influence public policy. The study considers the process by which the church arrives at its social policies, the attitudes of the ALC toward the forms and methods which it believes appropriate for the church in political action, and the political thought contained in its positions on public policy questions. It seeks to determine the extent to which the ALC reflects a transformationist _vis-a-vis_ a separationist stance with respect to church-state relations.

The study avoids a number of related concerns, such as current problems in church-state relations; the activities of other religious organizations and their impact upon public policy, except for purposes of comparison; and the significance of religion in American political life and thought. Nor is the study concerned with the propriety of church involvement in public policy, a question for theology and theological ethics. Rather it considers the public policy interest and activities of one religious organization.

---

[1] Hereafter the American Lutheran Church will frequently be referred to by the letters, ALC.

In the study, "political action" refers to those efforts on the part of the churches to participate in the formation of public policy. Such efforts may be directed either at government officials or at citizens in general. "Lobbying" is the effort to participate in the formation of public policy by attempting to influence government officials. Lobbying, thus, is one form of political action. Both terms are further defined in Chapter II. "Political realism" refers to the sophistication of the church's understanding of the American political process and its willingness to engage in those types of activities which are necessary if the church desires to participate effectively in the political process.

The thesis of the current study is that inasmuch as any national religious organization must engage in political action in order to be relevant politically, the American Lutheran Church evidences on the basis of its political thought and action a low degree of political realism in spite of a gradually developing consciousness of responsibility for the social order, a consciousness which includes the intent to be relevant politically.

Chapter II examines the hypothesis that national religious organizations must engage in political action in order to be relevant politically. The chapter describes the public policy-making process in American society, the role of interest groups in that process, and the types of political activities engaged in by Protestant churches. It also portrays the development of political realism in American Protestant churches.

Chapter III describes Luther's political thought and the significance of the development of Lutheranism with respect to political responsibility. The Chapter concludes with an evaluation of Lutheran political thought as a guide for political action today.

Chapter IV outlines the emerging social and political consciousness in American Lutheranism prior to 1960, the beginning of the current study, with special reference to the churches which merged into the present ALC. Chapter IV provides a background for an examination of the political consciousness in the ALC today.

Chapters V through IX examine the activity of the ALC with respect to public policy. Chapter V portrays the church's understanding of its political role including its desire to be relevant politically. Current efforts to achieve increased political realism also are noted. Chapter VI examines the social problems and public policy issues which have concerned the ALC since 1960 and comments additionally upon the relevance of its political activity. An analysis of the response of the ALC to the national crisis in race from 1968 to the present is presented in Chapter VII. Chapter VIII explicates the process by which social policy statements are formed and indicates the use which has been made of such statements. Chapter IX outlines the political thought in the ALC's social policy statements. Chapter X, the conclusion, analyzes and evaluates the thesis of

XUM

the study in light of the examination of the activity of the American Lutheran Church.

Other Considerations of the Study

The writer selected the present subject for study after his employment as assistant director of the Commission on Research and Social Action of the American Lutheran Church. That position afforded an opportunity to undertake an analysis of political action by the ALC and an evaluation of its political realism. It is the writer's conviction that American churches can be important participants in the formation of public policy. He shares the transformationist attitude that church efforts to influence public policy can be consistent with the democratic tradition and are necessary for the implementation of the churches' purposes.

The basic approach to the study is descriptive. It is not historical, except as required for introductory purposes. The study portrays the contemporary activity of the ALC insofar as that activity relates to public policy matters. At the same time, however, this activity is examined as to its political realism primarily on the basis of the overview of the public policy-making process and the development of Protestant political consciousness described in Chapter II. The study is limited to an examination of the ALC's political action at the national level. Comparable activity within the districts of the church

XUM

and at the congregational level is not included.

The primary research methods in the study are an examination of published and unpublished documents of the ALC and interviews. The documents included the Reports and Actions of the General Conventions of the church; official minutes of most of the ALC's divisions, commissions, and auxiliaries; church publications and periodicals; social policy statements; staff reports; letters; and memoranda. Interviews were conducted with 16 persons on the professional staff of the ALC as well as with Washington staffs of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. and the National Council of Churches. In addition, informal discussions have been held with other staff persons from time to time. All interviews were granted willingly. The average interview lasted approximately one and one-quarter hours. Where information could be damaging to existing relationships, descriptions are generalized. The writer's two and one-half years' staff experience with the Commission on Research and Social Action has also been an important ingredient in undertaking the study.

An Orientation to the American Lutheran Church

The American Lutheran Church was formed in 1960, a merger of German (American Lutheran Church), Norwegian (Evangelical Lutheran Church) and Danish (United Evangelical Lutheran Church) Lutheran groups. It was joined in 1963 by another Norwegian-background church, the Lutheran Free

Church.[1] The American Lutheran Church is the third largest Lutheran church in the United States. It has a baptized membership of 2,576,105 persons in 4,880 congregations and a clergy roster of 5,943 ministers.[2] In 1969 the church operated on a budget just in excess of $23 million. The ALC is a member of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., the Lutheran World Federation, and the World Council of Churches. It does not belong to the National Council of Churches, however.

The work of the ALC is carried on through nine divisions --American Missions, World Missions, Parish Education, College Education, Theological Education, Youth Activity, Publication, Social Service, and Pensions; four commissions--Evangelism, Research and Social Action, Worship and Church Music, and Public Communication; three auxiliaries--American Lutheran Church Men, American Lutheran Church Women, and the Luther League; two standing committees--Inter-Church Relations and Service to Military Personnel; and the Board of Trustees.

The highest legislative body is the biennial General

---

[1] According to the Office of the Secretary of the American Lutheran Church, the relative size of the merging groups, based upon baptized membership, was: American Lutheran Church--1,059,195; Evangelical Lutheran Church--1,174,494; United Evangelical Lutheran Church--73,091; and Lutheran Free Church--88,396. A 1963 report of the National Lutheran Council ("American Missions Together," prepared by the Division of American Missions, Chicago, June, 1963) showed that 38% of the membership of the new church was located in standard metropolitan statistical areas. This compared with 63% for the Lutheran Church in America and 55% for Lutherans generally. P. 2.

[2] Statistics as of December 31, 1968, obtained from the Office of Secretary.

Convention. In the interim between General Conventions, supreme authority is vested in a Church Council of 47 members, composed of the president, vice-president, and secretary of the church, the executive director plus one other member of the Board of Trustees, the president and a layman from each of the church's 18 administrative districts, and six representatives at large.[1] The Church Council is directly responsible for the work of the commissions and indirectly responsible, having powers of recommendation, for the divisions. The latter are directly responsible to the General Conventions of the church.

A considerable portion of this study relates to the work of the Commission on Research and Social Action. The Commission has primary responsibility for guiding the church on social, economic, and political issues. A majority of the church's social policy statements have been formulated by the Commission, although many have been drafted by the Church Council and the General Conventions. The Commission on Research

---

[1] Prior to the action of the 1968 General Convention and the subsequent ratification by the district, interim leadership of the American Lutheran Church was exercised by the Church Council and the Joint Council. The Joint Council operated as the legislative arm of the church while the Church Council maintained spiritual guidance of the body and reviewed the work of the several national offices. The Church Council was composed of 45 persons, including the president, vice president, and secretary of the church; the district president and one layman from each of the districts; and six representatives at large. The Joint Council was formed of the members of the Church Council plus the nine members of the Board of Trustees. These two councils existed during the entire period of the present study.

XUM

and Social Action is composed of nine persons selected by the Church Council. It operates with an executive staff of two persons.

The chapters which follow seek to describe, analyze, and evaluate the role of the American Lutheran Church in the American political process.

Chapter II

AMERICAN CHURCHES AND PUBLIC POLICY

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, Protestant social and political consciousness has experienced a number of fundamental shifts. The changes have recently been characterized in a description of four phases of development.[1] While there is considerable overlapping in the development, the description typifies the general emphasis in social and political consciousness in the policy of the mainline Protestant churches in each succeeding period.

The early phase was moral welfare. Carried over from the nineteenth and continued into the early part of the twentieth century, moral welfare found its primary expression in "social service," or remedial assistance to individuals and small groups. Most of the charitable work was directed by various social welfare agencies. This phase of Protestant social consciousness evidenced a strong concern for shaping personal morals and a lesser concern for changing the established order. The temperance movement and the campaign for prohibition gained considerable support from the churches during this phase.

---

[1] This writer is indebted to Dieter Hessel for bringing this classification to his attention. Cf. his Reconciliation and Conflict: Church Controversy Over Social Involvement (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), pp. 16-19.

A broadening concern for social issues developed in the 1930's, primarily as a result of the Depression, and continued until after World War II. During this phase, problems of economic welfare received growing attention from the churches. Increasingly, problems of world order, race relations, rural development, urban renewal, and conscientious objection to war also were discussed. This was the period in which "social education," the effort to make people sensitive to social problems in order to guide social change, expanded in the churches. This phase tended to be individualistic, seeking to effect changes by personal persuasion rather than by political organization.

The third phase was typified by the infusion of political realism into the churches' social thought and action. An increasing awareness of the difficulty of relating love to justice brought about this shift to political action in the 1950's and early 1960's. The churches realized that the dynamic power of injustice also was institutionalized in the social structures of society. In this phase, political realism began to permeate social idealism, and attention was focused upon the location and uses of power instead of sole reliance upon moral suasion. These direct efforts to achieve social reform and social justice ushered in the period of "social action," the effort to change social, economic, and political conditions. The pursuit of proximate justice by means of pragmatic public policy reform represented the "political action" dimension of social action.

The fourth phase, representing a minority movement at the present time, is revolutionary enthusiasm. This phase evidences a general frustration with the slow pace of democratic reform. Instead, direct challenges are made upon the social structures in an effort to force changes in their operation. The strong reactions to the Vietnam war, to the universities, and to institutionalized racism reflect this approach.

These phases do not represent sharp divisions in a progressive development. The transitions have been a gradual process. However, the periods typify the general emphasis in successive phases. The description indicates that the development of political realism in the churches is largely a post-World War II achievement. Within each denomination, however, there is a constant tension between the awareness and exercise of political realism and the earlier phase of social education and moral persuasion. Later it will be shown that this is one of the current tensions within the American Lutheran Church. This chapter describes the development of political realism in American Protestantism and, after a consideration of the ways in which public policy is formed, examines the present political activity of religious groups.

The Development of Political Realism in the Churches

Much of the Protestant involvement in the political process has been described as a "non-political approach to politics."[1] This approach stems from a convergence of nineteenth century secular liberalism with its exalted confidence in rational progress and religious pietism with its concern for private moral virtures and introspection. As a result, Protestant political thought has tended to be utopian, especially in international affairs, individualistic and moralistic, harmonistic, and escapist from the problem of power.[2] Protestant political action, accordingly, has been "politically irrelevant, morally irresponsible, and biblically unsound."[3] American political morality also has been described as

> *in itself* an anti-political ethic: an ethic built of rules for individual behavior, dividing men sharply into good and bad, looking to motives in the man rather than consequences in the world, emphasizing "character" and "integrity" rather than effects and situations, assuming that what is "moral" is easily known, and that the only problem is to arouse the energy to do it.[4]

---

1. Ernest Lefever, "The Protestant Nonpolitical Approach to Politics," *The Christian Scholar*, XXXVIII (June, 1955), 90-98.

2. Cf. George Kennan, *American Diplomacy*, 1900-1950 (New York: Mentor Books, 1951), p. 82ff.

3. Lefever, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

4. Robert Lee Miller, "The Problem of Ethics in Contemporary American Politics" (Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Yale University, 1958), pp. 3-4.

XUM

This approach is reflected in the reluctance of many Christians and some churches to enter the political fray, the uncertainty about using corporate power to further the cause of justice, and the tendency to consider some issues as "moral" and others as "political" or "secular." The former are usually problems of individual morality, such as temperance, marriage and divorce, sexual conduct, and forms of entertainment. The "non-political" approach also is seen in an almost exclusive reliance upon education and individual initiative as the chief means for social change, and a concentration upon charity and social welfare to the relative neglect of concern for justice and social action to change the structures and laws of society. The primary political emphasis has been in the election of religious and moral men to public office. Much of Protestantism's focus on the individual moral life has meant an indifference to politics and in effect has lent support to the status quo. It has led to disillusionment when the power of self-interest has prevailed over moral exhortations, an inability to pursue justice, and a resistance to the creative uses of conflict and power.

Today, however, there is a growing political realism guiding the involvement of religious organizations in the making of public policy. Much of the credit for the change goes to the Social Gospel movement, the late nineteenth and early twentieth century religious response to the social and political challenges of industrialization.[1] The Social Gospel movement exhibited a strong social consciousness as a corrective to the introspection of pietism, adopted a critical stance toward the prevailing economic order, and realized the existence of major defects in the social order itself apart from individual moral weakness. It was to achieve reform through the alteration of social structures as well as through individual regeneration. The Social Gospel was not able to overcome the optimism and progressivism of liberal idealism. It required the two world wars, the Depression, and the articulate intellectual leadership of Reinhold Niebuhr to give political relevance to the Social Gospel emphasis.

Niebuhr, until recently professor of Christian ethics at Union Theological Seminary, challenged both the privatization of Christian life characterized by pietism and the individualistic-moralism and utopianism of the Social Gospel.[2]

---

[1] The significance of the Social Gospel movement is portrayed by Charles Hopkins, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940); Henry May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949); Robert M. Miller, American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958); and Donald Meyer, The Protestant Search for Political Realism (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960).

[2] Cf. Moral Man and Immoral Society (New York: Scribner's, 1932); Christianity and Power Politics (New York: Scribner's, 1940); The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness (New York: Scribner's, 1944); The Nature and Destiny of Man (New York: Scribner's, 1949); and Christian Realism and Political Problems (New York: Scribner's, 1953). Probably the best systematic treatment of Niebuhr's thought is the study by Gordon Harland, The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960).

Vis-a-vis the alliance of the churches with social and political conservatism, he affirmed the prophetic tradition of the Judeo-Christian tradition. He contended that a neglect of the social order led to an uncritical acceptance of the status quo and served to make the churches a tool of the privileged power groups in society. He criticized philanthropy as less than justice because it avoided the readjustment of unequal power patterns.

Niebuhr's main criticism against the Social Gospel and liberalism was directed at the naive assumption that a sentimental appeal to reason and conscience was adequate to change the political and social order. Instead Niebuhr pointed to the power and moral ambivalence of self-interest and group egoism as basic to a realistic understanding of politics. He realized that all interests seek protection through power and justification in morally acceptable terms. He emphasized that even reason is never a pure instrument, but works in the service of self or collective interest. The basis of society is power, and the task of politics is to discover the best means of controlling power. This is accomplished not by moral appeals but by checking power with power. Niebuhr contended that justice rather than love was the guide for political action. Love is always an "impossible possibility." It is both the norm and the critique of justice, and finds its closest political approximation in justice. He underscored the constant dialectical tension between love and justice. Justice depends upon a balance of power which is not possible apart from coercion. But justice is more than a cynical balance of power; it is a struggle, a calculated effort, to achieve a more equal distribution of power in society, regulated by the principles of equality and liberty.

The effect of Niebuhr's contribution to Protestant political thought has been to make it possible for the churches to participate in political activity with a sophistication more equal to the challenge of power politics and yet with respect for the sources of the Christian tradition. He affirmed controversy, compromise, power, and consensus as positive endeavors and as necessary for prudent political activity. Niebuhr recaptured the tragic note in all human undertakings. He warned against the perversions of moral righteousness in politics which serve only to destroy the basis for compromise, undermine public responsibility, and create an aversion to controversy in politics and life. Over against the moralism in much of American Protestantism, his political ethics has brought together prophetic judgment and responsible political activity. Today, most if not all of the churches' social education and action units and their Washington offices have been greatly influenced by Niebuhr's political ethics.

Three characteristics of this new social and political realism have been noted.[1] The first of the new elements is an emphasis on the social responsibility of the churches. Religious organizations increasingly view social involvement as one of their important concerns alongside personal regeneration. They are, in other words, aware of the social context of human life. A second characteristic is an awareness that social and political structures are not divinely ordained, but can be changed by human effort. This shift from the previous presumption in favor of established patterns has given new opportunities for social justice. The third element is an increased concern for the oppressed and the poor. The latter two elements, especially, indicate a movement away from a socially conservative view of providence and a paternalistic understanding of love.

---

[1] John C. Bennett, Christian Ethics and Social Policy (New York: Scribner's, 1946), Chapter 1.

This political realism now generally undergirds the activities of the majority of American Protestant "mainline" churches and the National Council of Churches as they seek to influence public policy. It informs their positions on particular issues and provides a perspective for political action. While the "nonpolitical approach to politics" still finds much expression among the members of the churches and to varying degrees within denominational leadership, the realism of Niebuhr's political ethics gives increased political relevance and moral responsibility to the churches' involvement in the public policy-making process.

XUM

The Public Policy-Making Process

Contrary to popular assumptions, the average American as an individual citizen has little direct impact upon public policy. Voting, for instance, the most general form of citizen participation in government, basically serves to name persons to public office rather than to determine policy.[1] Only five to seven percent of the eligible citizens normally participate in political party activities and approximately ten percent contribute funds to a political party.[2] Thus, "[w]hile every individual could be classified on some sort of scale as to political, economic, or social power, today power to affect public policy rests mainly upon an individual's relationship to a major group or organization. Single individuals in this country, unless affiliated with some power group, seldom influence the course of government."[1]

---

[1] Charles Lindblom observes that "[v]oting may be significant not as a method of influencing specific policy decisions but simply as an alternative (called 'democracy') to recruitment of proximate policy makers by inheritance, by lot or rotation, or by consultation and maneuvering among a self-perpetuating oligarchy, as in the U.S.S.R." He notes that this will have some limited implications for policy ("policy makers so chosen will presumably pursue policies different from those of a nominee of oligarchs"), but its main effect will be to energize policy makers, creating a pressure to act. The Policy Making Process (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968), pp. 46-47. It should be noted, however, that elections sometimes indicate public opinion on a specific policy. The 1968 national election clearly reflected on the Vietnam policy of the Johnson administration. The support of Senator McCarthy in the New Hampshire primary and in caucuses in many states was another expression of voter feeling on a specific policy. In most situations, however, Lindblom's contention can be accepted.

[2] T. R. Dye, Politics, Economics, and the Public (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966), p. 59.

The group or pluralist basis of political life is recognized by many political commentators today.[2] Pluralist theory holds that individuals exercise influence in society primarily through groups and that the American system of government is one in which many groups compete for control or influence over the instruments of power. It views our political system as providing "the brokerage of interest among minorities (wherein a consensus of minorities--or a majority of minorities--determines public policy after negotiation and compromise)."[3] Public policy is formed through the interaction of the several different groups in the various branches and levels of government, political parties, private interest groups, the mass media and even foreign governments participating in the struggle for power. The public interest groups, including churches, play an important role in this process.

"Public policy" is a generic term referring to the product of governmental decisions, decisions on any given subject made by public officials acting in their official capacity.[1] Public policy consists of the principles, regulations, and procedures which determine courses of action under the sanction of government. It is frequently the result of diverse and even conflicting decisions. Public policy is the end product of the interaction of the groups competing for power. Earl Latham defines public policy as "the equilibrium reached in this struggle at any given moment," representing "a balance which the contending factions of groups constantly strive to weigh in their favor."[2] Others, however, while recognizing the validity of the pluralist theory, contend that the making of policy is less mechanical than "equilibrium" seems to imply.[3] In any case, the making of public policy is much more complex than the oversimplified division of responsibility wherein the Congress makes laws, the president enforces them, and the courts interpret them.

---

[1] R. Joseph Monsen, Jr. and Mark W. Cannon, The Makers of Public Policy: American Power Groups and Their Ideologies (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), p. 1.

[2] Pioneering work in American pluralism was done by Arthur Bentley, The Process of Government [1908], edited by Peter Odegard (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967); E. P. Herring, The Politics of Democracy, 2nd ed. (New York: Norton, 1965) and Group Representation Before Congress (New York: Russell and Russell, 1929); David Truman, The Governmental Process (New York: Knopf, 1951); and Earl Latham, The Group Basis of Politics (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1952).

[3] Monsen and Cannon, op. cit., p. 3.

---

[1] Richard Gable in "Interest Groups as Policy Shapers," The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXIX (September, 1958) defines public policy as a "decision or set of decisions that establishes a purpose, creates a precedent, or lays down a course of action." P. 85. The decision, however, is but one of the steps in making public policy, as noted later in this chapter. Public policy results from such decisions and therefore should be distinguished from the decision itself. Accordingly, Charles Lindbloom refers to the "policy-making system" rather than to a "decision-making system." The Intelligence of Democracy (New York: Free Press, 1965), p. 11.

[2] Latham, op. cit., pp. 35-36. He goes so far as to say that the legislature "referees the group struggle, ratifies the victories of the successful coalitions, and records the terms of the surrenders, compromises, and conquests in the form of statutes. Every statute tends to represent a compromise because the process of accommodating conflicts of group interest is one of deliberation and consent." Thus a vote "tends to represent the composition of strength, that is, the balance of power, among the contending groups at the moment of voting." P. 35.

[3] Lindblom in The Intelligence of Democracy is critical of Latham's emphasis upon public policy as an equilibrium of the competing groups, claiming that there are many other variables such as procedural rules, the structure of the

The formulation of public policy is a continuous and dynamic process. Six stages in the policy-making process have been delineated: formulation, articulation, mobilization, codification, application, and redefinition.[1] Formulation is the calling of public attention to the existence of a problem. The degree of importance that the public attaches to a given problem or issue determines the attention which the problem receives in the policy-making process. Indeed, "the political process begins at the point where private conflicts are made public."[2] Once formulated, problems tend to remain in the public consciousness for a considerable period

---

institutions, and "deals" which make the process less mechanical. He claims that policies result from a process of "partisan mutual adjustment," through an interaction of group equilibrium and characteristics of rule-making bodies. Monsen and Cannon, op. cit., emphasize that legislators are more than mere reflections of the principal groups which elect them. Latham, however, while at times overstating his case, does recognize other variables in the legislative process. His equilibrium is a dynamic and not a static concept. Op. cit., p. 36f.

[1] Edward Schneier, ed. Policy-Making in American Government (New York: Basic Books, 1969). This selection of readings is a useful overview of the operation and dynamics of these stages. Harold Lasswell in "The Public Interest: Proposing Principles of Content and Procedures" in Carl J. Friedrich, ed., The Public Interest ("Nomos," Vol. V; New York: Atherton, 1966) suggests seven categories: intelligence, recommending, prescribing, invoking, applying, appraising, and terminating.

[2] Ibid., p. xi.

of time. Not only is formulation the beginning of the policy process, but frequently those persons who are able to define the issues rather than simply choose from already-given alternatives exercise the greatest power in the process.[1]

Articulation is the determination of policy objectives and the development of strategy for presenting the issues. Here indeed politics is the art of the possible, defining the objectives in such a way as to maximize support and to minimize opposition without sacrificing principles. The tactics of articulation involve problems of timing, phrasing and location--"knowing how much to ask for and when."[2]

Mobilization involves the securing of allies and the neutralization of opponents. This third stage is the waging of the battle leading to official decisions, beginning the more visible aspect of the political process. Lobbying activity is most noticeable in this stage.

The fourth stage is codification. Here agreements are reached and public decisions are made. Many groups and individuals, private and governmental, are involved in the policy-making process, but the formal decisions are made by public officials. Codification is "policy-making" in the narrow sense of the word.

The fifth stage is the application of the policy. In this stage, the new course of action is set in motion and applied to specific instances.

---

[1] Eric Larabee, "The Politics of Strategy" in Schneier, op. cit., Chapter 1.

[2] Schneier, op. cit., p. 49.

Redefinition, the final stage, involves the reconsideration of the problem. At this point the entire process begins again. In many ways, redefinition really begins after codification.

Due to the continuous and dynamic nature of the policy-making process, these stages frequently overlap. The process is not necessarily the orderly procedure which a description of the stages suggests. Problems are constantly being formulated and redefined throughout the process. Attitudes and strategies are continually being modified. Mobilization is an important factor in application and codification is greatly affected by application. Also, different groups become involved with different problems and even the several branches and units of government are affected by the nature of the problem as well as by their own particular responsibilities for it. The several stages, however, do indicate the scope and complexity of the process of which public policy is the end product.

Policy-making in a democracy is a shared responsibility. Public policy has many "makers" and responsibility for it is very diffused. While all of the groups mentioned earlier are involved, the major national policy-makers are the members of the Congress, the president, appointed administrative officials of various types, and key party leaders. These are the "proximate policy makers," persons with legal or extra-legal authority who are closest to the actual making of decisions.[1] But one can also speak of a policy-making ladder ranging from the president to the non-voter and including:

--the president
--congressional and other key party leaders, congressional committee chairmen, top administrators, and Supreme Court Justices
--other legislative leaders, policy-making judges, and high-level administrators
--ordinary legislators and some administrators
--lower-level party leaders, interest group leaders, and major public-opinion leaders
--politically active citizens
--ordinary voters
--non-voters[2]

Policy is made through the cooperation and interaction of these persons and groups. Thus, to explain how policy is made is to explain the complex ways in which this cooperation and interaction takes place.[3]

On the broadest possible scale, cooperation takes place among all of those on the policy-making ladder. It is a matter of two-way communication with desires as to what is wanted moving up the ladder and indications as to what is possible moving down the ladder. Both desires and indications are endlessly reconsidered. Opinions and preferences are sent up the ladder and each rung of the ladder sends down information and advice that helps the recipient rung clarify and amend policy decisions which reach down to help the citizens understand and better express their desires.

---

[1] Lindblom identifies as "proximate policy makers," "those participants who are 'closest' or most proximate to the actual making of a decision. They are those who share immediate legal authority to decide on specific policies, together with other immediate participants in policy decisions, like top party leaders, to whom the above have conceded extra-legal authority or who, for any other reason, are strong and immediate participants in actual decisions on a policy--excluding, however, any of the above legal authorities who waive their control over decisions in favor of others. . . ." The Policy Making Process, op. cit., footnote 3 on p. 30.

[2] Ibid., p. 113.

[3] Ibid., p. 31.

On a more narrow scale, cooperation takes place among the major decision-makers and those leaders with more influence upon them than the average voter. Besides the organized forms of cooperation including the congressional committee system, executive leaders involved in the legislative process, and political parties, a process of informal cooperation involving mutual adjustment and "bargaining" with private interest groups also takes place. In fact, "[h]ierarchical organization, committee systems, executive leaders, cabinets, and party organizations are islands of formal organization in a sea of informal mutual adjustment."[1]

Private Interest Groups and Lobbying Activity

Interest groups are an integral part of the public policy-making process.[2] There are currently more than 16,000 interest groups in the United States.[1] While all such groups do not have an active interest in public policy, many have a limited interest even though their primary purpose may be in quite unrelated areas.[2] Any private organized group is a political interest group when and insofar as it relates to the public policy-making process.[3] More than 500 interest groups

---

[1] Ibid., p. 93.

[2] The following studies were helpful on interest groups and lobbying: "Unofficial Government: Pressure Groups and Lobbies," The ANNALS of the Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXIX, op. cit., Donald Blaisdell, American Democracy Under Pressure (New York: Ronald Press, 1957); Abraham Holtzman,

---

Interest Groups and Lobbying (New York: Macmillan, 1966); V. O. Key, Jr., Politics, Political Parties, and Pressure Groups, 5th ed. (New York: Growell Press, 1964) and Public Opinion and American Democracy (New York: Knopf, 1961); Dayton McKean, Party and Pressure Politics (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1949); Lester Milbrath, The Washington Lobbyists (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963); Karl Schriftgiesser, The Lobbyists: The Art and Business of Influencing Lawmakers (Boston: Little, Brown, 1951); Andrew Scott and Margaret Hunt, Congress and Lobbies: Image and Reality (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965, 1966); Truman, op. cit.; Harmon Zeigler, Interest Groups in American Society (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1964); Monsen and Cannon, op. cit.; and United States Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, General Interim Report, 81st Cong., 2nd Sess., 1950.

1. National Organizations of the United States, Vol. I, 5th ed. ("Encyclopedia of Associations"; Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1968) lists more than 13,600 trade associations, professional societies, labor unions, fraternal and patriotic organizations, and other voluntary groups.

2. According to Marver H. Bernstein: "The centrifugal tendencies of American political arrangements encourage the organization of interest groups to influence government activities. Every agency tends to have a constituency in roughly the same way a senator or representative has, except that it is likely to be defined not in terms of congressional districts or states but rather in terms of functionally-oriented groups that are nation-wide or regional in scope." The Job of the Federal Executive (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1958), p. 128.

3. "Interest group" is used throughout the current study in preference to "pressure group" or "special interest group," terms which convey an emotional negative judgment upon selfish and irresponsible interests. Persons tend to reject this judgment upon their own group and rather apply it as a negative value judgment against the activities of groups with different

have a continuing interest in public policy, although the groups with major interest probably do not number more than two or three score.[1] It is estimated that perhaps one-third of the American public belongs to groups having at least some interest in public policy.[2] The major organized interest groups concerned with public policy are business, the professions, labor, agriculture, education, the civil and military bureaucracies, including veterans' groups, civil rights, and religion.

Interest groups serve a number of functions in the political process. In the first place, they provide functional representation as a supplement to geographical representation.[3] They help keep public officials and agencies informed of the

---

goals. Truman, _op. cit._, correctly notes that "pressure" is a method or category of methods which can be used by any group. P. 39. In defining "interest group," he suggests "a shared-attitude group that makes certain claims upon other groups." P. 37. It becomes a political interest group when it makes claims through or upon any of the institutions of government. However, V. O. Key, Jr., seeks to redeem the term "pressure group." _Politics, Political Parties, and Pressure Groups_, _op. cit._, p. 18. It should be noted, though, that all private organized groups do not seek to influence public policy and some do so only tangentially to other purposes for which they exist. This study focuses upon private organized groups insofar as they seek to influence public policy. Interest groups composed of public officials and operating within the government are not included within the term as used herein.

[1] Key, _Politics, Political Parties, and Pressure Groups_, _op. cit._, p. 129.

[2] Monsen and Cannon, _op. cit._, p. 49.

[3] In this regard, Key notes: "The view that pressure groups are pathological growths in the body politic is . . . more picturesque than accurate. A safer assumption is that groups developed to fill gaps in the political system." _Politics, Political Parties, and Pressure Groups_, _op. cit._, p. 130.

views of various segments of the population in order that such expressions might be given maximum consideration in the development of public policy. In fact, congressmen often see this as the primary justification for the involvement of interest groups in policy formation.[1] Each interest group seeks to protect its interests and to influence public policy favorably to its concerns. Because organized interests represent concentrated power, they will almost always have more influence than unorganized interests. This functional or interest representation has led some commentators to speak of interest groups as a "third house" of Congress.[2]

Secondly, interest groups perform an educational function. They help clarify issues and needs and create a favorable climate of opinion for future action. They also perform a fact-finding and critical function, especially in hearings on the drafting of legislation, emphasizing the need for particular legislative or administrative action. In a sense, they are initiators of policy formation: "the laws which Congress enacts originate in most cases with the informal agencies, that is, the outside pressure groups."[3] Along with administrative agencies, "private interest groups have come to be the principal originators of policy, while legislative groups, along with administrative and private interest groups, are the major shapers of public policy."[1]

---

[1] Scott and Hunt, op. cit., p. 91.

[2] Key, Politics, Political Parties, and Pressure Groups, op. cit., p. 130.

[3] Blaisdell, op. cit., p. 218.

In the third place, interest groups serve as brokers between individual citizens and public officials and agencies. They help reduce the number of conflicting and diverse demands, making it easier for public officials to resolve differences among competing groups. In other words, by interacting with other groups in the political process interest groups help achieve a readjustment of power in society. Legislation is often the result of negotiation between and coalition efforts among many interest groups. In such cases, the legislative act may only ratify a compromise reached by the involved interest groups.

Fourthly, interest groups provide a check on official intentions and actions. They seek to keep their members informed of the progress of measures with which they are concerned as well as to make them aware of the thinking of officials. They also scrutinize pending legislation, administrative regulations, and administrative and judicial decisions which may affect their members.

Finally, interest groups serve as a counter influence to the separation of powers in the governmental process. Transcending party lines and the separations between the branches of government, interest groups are able to help avoid deadlocks in the policy process. The very pursuit of their own particular interests helps eliminate many of the roadblocks along the way.

---

[1] Gable, op. cit., p. 85.

One might expect the political parties to perform some of these functions, and to a limited extent they do. But political parties remain neutral on most issues. Parties primarily function in leadership recruitment and serve as consensus-builders, making only broad policy commitments. They tend to stay free of rigid ideological commitments and seek to form the largest possible interest group coalitions in the selection of political candidates and through the articulation of broad policy objectives. Interest groups, on the other hand, are primarily interested in specific policies and in gaining their incorporation into public policy. The party system stands as a buffer between the interest group system and the formal policy-making units, seeking to reshape the multitude of particular interests into a smaller number of general policies.

The feature common to all interest groups is the desire for effective access to the key points of decision-making in the governmental process.[1] The status and size of the interest group, the extent to which the group is effectively organized, the skills and other qualifications of the leaders and agents of the group, and the effective use of its wealth are all important in the attainment of this objective. The more effective groups engage agents or representatives--lobbyists--to promote their concerns and influence governmental decisions.[1] The current number of full-time registered lobbyists in Washington is in excess of 600 persons.[2]

---

[1] The term "effective access," in fact, constitutes Truman's approach to lobbying. Op. cit., 264ff. Milbrath uses a somewhat similar term, "effective communication." Op. cit., p. 179ff.

The work of the lobbyist has traditionally been seen as the influencing of legislative decisions. But today lobbyists spend a minority of their time on such activities.[3] The main task of Washington lobbyists is not "lobbying" in the narrow sense, but using Congress as a means of influencing the administrative branch of government, obtaining information, or achieving favorable publicity for their interest group.[4] Most congressional contacts are requests for help with personal, business, and professional problems with government. Perhaps the most important service which a lobbyist performs for his interest group is teaching the latter how to accommodate to governmental policy.[5]

---

1. This definition includes all contact and any methods used by interest group representatives to influence public policy. Such activity by private citizens acting on their own behalf or by officials in governmental agencies is excluded. It might be noted, however, that Milbrath included executive lobbying in his definition of lobbying: "the stimulation and transmission of a communication, by someone other than a citizen acting on his own behalf, directed to a governmental decision-maker with the hope of influencing his decision." Op. cit., p. 8.

The 1950 House Committee investigating lobbying activities noted: "Lobbying is as natural to our kind of government as breathing is to the human organism, and it is almost equally complex." General Interim Report, op. cit., p. 23.

2. Milbrath, op. cit., p. 22.

3. Lewis Anthony Dexter, How Organizations Are Represented in Washington (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969), p. 7.

4. Ibid., p. 80f.

5. Ibid., p. 103.

The popular image of lobbying characterized by political corruption, underhanded methods, and the payment of election expenses is more descriptive of lobbying in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries than it is today. Herring drew the distinction between the "old lobby" and the "new lobby" four decades ago.[1] Today lobbyists usually work in the open, offering assistance and services to responsive legislators and administrators. They stimulate and coordinate grass roots pressures, keep the interests of their members constantly before officials, and communicate between a considerable bloc of voters and important decision-makers.

Most lobbying activity is carried out through direct contacts with public officials. Direct methods include such activities as personal presentation of viewpoints, the presentation of research results, and testifying before congressional and regulatory commission hearings. Milbrath notes that 80% of his sample of lobbyists preferred these direct methods, and 58% of the lobbyists and 52% of his congressional respondents rated the personal presentation of viewpoints as the single most effective method.[2] Scott and Hunt found that committee hearings were rated moderately to very effective by nearly three-fourths of their sample and office calls similarly rated by nearly one-half.[3]

---

[1] Group Representation Before Congress, op. cit., p. 30f.

[2] Op. cit., pp. 212-13.

[3] Op. cit., p. 78. In this regard they draw the conclusion that "the instruments that might be important are illegal

XUM

Interest groups and lobbyists appear to be most valued by public officials when they provide expert information and data on the proposals being considered.[1] Such information, especially if provided by competing interest groups, helps officials make more intelligent decisions. Indeed, the provision of reliable information is the main source of interest group power. It assists "policy makers whose responsibilities require that they look realistically into the merits of alternative policies and who demand competent analysis because their opponents will be armed with it." It aims to show "how a policy desired by the interest group squares with the policy maker's philosophy, values, or principles."[2] When different interest groups provide information and technical documentation for their positions, the quality of legislation is usually improved.[3]

While direct methods are most frequently used, a number of indirect techniques also are used. These include, listed in declining order of effectiveness, contact of legislators or administrators through constituents, or close friends (the

---

(bribery), suspect (making a campaign contribution), or impractical (trying to influence a congressmen's election). Little of significance is left save office calls and testifying before Congressional committees." P. 88.

[1] Ibid., p. 59.

[2] Lindblom, The Policy Making Process, op. cit., p. 65.

[3] Emanuel Celler, "Pressure Groups in Congress," The ANNALS of the Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXIX, op. cit., p. 7.

"rifle" approach), letter and telegram campaigns (the "shotgun" approach), public relations campaigns, and efforts to publicize voting records. All of these indirect techniques, however, are probably less effective than the direct approaches.[1] Scott and Hunt found that individually-written letters were rated moderately to very effective by more than one-half of the respondents.[2] Telephone calls and telegrams were regarded as less effective, and form letters and petitions were generally considered ineffective.[3] Extensive mobilization campaigns in the form of public relations campaigns or letter-writing appeals are used primarily to bolster other lobbying efforts.[4] Interest groups with more limited resources, however, still make extensive use of this method, leading one writer to describe it as "probably the least effective and most relied upon lobbying technique."[5] Social lobbying, campaign contributions, and campaign activity are other indirect techniques, but these are regarded as generally ineffective. Most lobbyists use them primarily as channels of access.[6]

---

[1] Milbrath, _op. cit._, p. 236f.

[2] _Op. cit._, p. 73.

[3] _Ibid._

[4] Milbrath, _op. cit._, p. 249.

[5] Zeigler, _op. cit._, p. 272. On the other hand, Holtzman has noted that "if such letters activate the neutral to consider issues more carefully, help the undecided to make up their minds, or to induce the committee to move more forcefully, then letter writing campaigns produce valuable political dividends." _Op. cit._, p. 103.

[6] Milbrath, _op. cit._, p. 255, and Scott and Hunt, _op. cit._, pp. 81-82.

While Congress has been the traditional focal point of lobbying activity, interest groups also focus attention on the other branches of government. As Congress has increasingly delegated authority to administrative agencies to make rules and regulations, these agencies in effect have become an extention of the legislative process. Lobbyists pursue their interests through attempts to influence appointments, public relations campaigns, administrative hearings, and the personal intervention of responsive congressmen. Their impact also is felt in the judicial system through attempts to influence appointments and through litigation to test the constitutionality of unfavorable laws, frequently in amicus curiae briefs, or through pressure for the enforcement of laws relating to particular interests.

Interest group activity also relates to the political parties where it ranges from attempts to influence platforms to the promotion of candidates and soliciting support for nominees. The party platform, to the degree that it incorporates a group's interests, gives tentative assurance to an interest group of a later voice in party affairs. Election activity, however, is generally not considered essential to the effectiveness of the interest group. Participation in the electoral process usually is as the "junior partner,"[1] as an ally of the regular party organization.

Interest groups thus relate to all aspects of the policy-making process. They are concerned with all branches of the government and with other private interest groups involved in the determination of public policy. They also relate to all of the stages of the policy-making process outlined earlier. While their activity publicly has been most noticeable in the mobilization stage, they also contribute to the formulation of issues, the articulation of objectives and strategy, the procedures of application, and redefinition of the issues.

---

[1] Key, Public Opinion and American Democracy, op. cit., p. 524.

The overall effectiveness of lobbying is difficult to evaluate. Few lobbyists serve only as listening posts, conveying information on official intentions and actions back to their groups. The majority are advocates of the interests of their groups.[1] Large membership organizations appear to be viewed by both lobbyists and congressmen as more effective than smaller ones, due to their greater power at the polls.[2] But the small size of most groups, their heterogeneous membership, the difficulty of effecting intra-group communication, and the membership's generally stronger interest in political party and candidate considerations of issues, tend to make any effort aimed at the mobilization of votes extremely difficult. Most interest groups have a generally low visibility, lending support to the expression, "invisible government," although the visibility tends to rise in a congressman's areas of speciality.[3] Most congressmen, though, are not contacted by large numbers of groups, and there are few instances of frequent and continuing contact with any single group.[1] Lobbyists generally avoid contact with those opposed to their interests and reserve their personal contacts for favorable and wavering congressmen on the more significant issues.[2] Significantly, a large majority of congressmen view interest groups as moderately to very important in obtaining favorable congressional action.[3] Limits on the effectiveness of lobbyists include the degree to which their demands are viewed as legitimate, their ability at persuasion, conflict with other interest groups, the fact that citizens frequently belong to a number of interest groups with conflicting interests and the effectiveness of communication between the interest group and the respective decision-makers.[4]

---

[1] Holtzman, op. cit., pp. 75-76.

[2] Milbrath, op. cit., p. 348, and Scott and Hunt, op. cit., p. 35.

[3] Scott and Hunt, op. cit., p. 55.

Successful lobbying is a complex activity, and few interest groups have adequate financial and staff resources to undertake it unilaterally. Thus many groups form lobbying coalitions, a number of interest groups coalescing around a

---

1. Ibid., p. 56.

2. Milbrath, op. cit., pp. 217-18. Much lobbying tends to be defensive in nature, especially business lobbying. It begins when interest of the particular organization are threatened. "Most lobbyists, most of the time, act to reenforce, strengthen, and reassure congressmen and staff who tend to be on their side. They relatively rarely argue with known enemies." Dexter, op. cit., p. 63.

3. Scott and Hunt, op. cit., p. 61.

4. Lindblom, The Policy Making Process, op. cit., p. 68.

particular concern and then dissolving to form again on a different issue. In this way, they can exploit the potential strength of several groups, coordinating strategy and tactics, sharing information, and dividing assignments. Likewise interest groups seek support from other groups with only a secondary interest in a matter in order to increase their own power.

But interest groups are only one of the forces involved in making public policy. Milbrath found that about one-half of his sample of lobbyists regarded their activity as the least significant force in comparison with the president, the Congress, executive agencies, the courts, political parties, opinion-leaders, and voters.[1] Today no interest group has a monoply on information or constituent support. Few legislators actually experience "pressure." Rather, the impact of an interest group on the legislative process "depends more on the harmony of values between the groups and the legislators than it does on the ability of a group to wield its 'power' either through skillful techniques or presumed electoral influence."[2]

Churches and Political Action

Churches have the same opportunities and the same strengths and weaknesses of other private interest groups when it comes to the influencing of public policy.[1] Their only limitations are the members' attitudes as to what is appropriate for them, their organization and resources, and the public's tolerance of church activity in the political process. The greatest strength in church involvement in political activity probably lies in any integrity of the action, the responsibility of spokesmen to the group which they represent and responsiveness to the rank-and-file, and in their claim to basic values of the community at large.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 351-52.

[2] Zeigler, *op. cit.*, p. 274.

The activities of American churches with respect to public policy generally belong to one of three types: indirect influence upon the ethos and value system of the nation, social education within the religious organization with emphasis upon the political and social responsibility of individual members, and direct efforts to influence public policy.[2] These distinctions are not absolute, inasmuch as a particular activity may apply to more than one type. For example, a church social policy statement may relate to both

---

1. Cf. Stedman, op. cit. A number of these weaknesses have been examined by George Growell in "American Cultural Values Obstructing Christian Social Action" (Unpublished Th.D dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1966). Growell seeks to show that the American social system discourages involvement in social action. Although the system allows freedom for action, the patterns of membership, participation and leadership associated with voluntary associations as well as family and job obligations, make effective action difficult.

2. John C. Bennett delineates these three types of activities in his Christian Ethics and Social Policy, op. cit., and Christians and the State (New York: Scribner's, 1958), p. 278ff.

the second and third types. These categories are useful, however, for the consideration of general patterns of church political activity.

Few persons question the propriety of religious organizations as they seek to influence the ethos and value system of the nation. Here the churches contribute to the general moral tone of society, inculcating respect for the value of persons, encouraging responsible citizenship and government service, and contributing to the civil consensus which supports ordered political life. The churches' protection of the freedom of the institutional church also contributes to the preservation of other freedoms in society. In addition, the social, political, and racial inclusiveness of church membership helps contribute to political and social reconciliation. While the churches are not usually conscious of a primary intention to influence public policy through this approach, it does affect the climate within which public policy is made, and it can help serve either to expand or to reduce the range of political options which are available on particular issues. This type of activity has only an indirect influence on the public policy-making process.

The second type of activity is social education within the churches. This activity prepares members for political action in their individual capacities. While some of the more conservative religious groups resist the approach, many churches today seek to further social education within their organizations. Social education seeks to affect public decisions through the participation of members in political activities. It points to the goals, criteria, and ethical values which should influence decisions, serves to focus attention on public needs, and attempts to motivate members to assume more active citizenship roles. Various methods are employed, ranging from printed study materials to training sessions on social action techniques to seminars on issues and strategies. Social policy statements also are a part of social education insofar as they are used as an educational tool within the membership. In all these ways, social education influences public opinion and contributes to policy-making. It enters into the formulation, articulation, and redefinition stages of policy-making.

The third type of activity involves direct action to influence public policy either through public opinion or through direct approaches to government officials and agencies. Needless to say, this is the type of activity which creates most controversy in the churches. Several forms of this activity can be noted, including petitions in social policy statements, testimony before government agencies, the communication of official social policy statements via the mass media, and various forms of intervention, such as official participation in "freedom rides," picketing, and public protest. Direct action also may have various degrees of authoritativeness, ranging from policy statements of delegated assemblies, statements from denominational executives, action by policy boards of the churches, to public positions or actions taken by clergymen. Or direct action may stem from unofficial groups within the religious organizations or from commissions officially appointed to speak to the church and its members. Direct action relates most specifically to the mobilization stage of policy-making.

There is considerable debate within the churches as to the use of social policy statements or direct action projects.[1]

---

[1] The following studies indicate some of the tension in the churches in these matters: Charles Glock, Benjamin Ringer, and Earl Babbie, To Comfort and to Challenge: A Dilemma of the Contemporary Church (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967); Charles Glock and Rodney Stark, Religion and Society in Tension (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965); Rodney Stark and Charles Glock, American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968); Jeffrey Hadden, The Gathering Storm in the Churches: The Widening Gap Between Clergy and Laymen (Garden City, N. J.: Doubleday, 1969); and Lawrence Kersten, "The Lutheran Ethic and Social Change" (Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, East Michigan University, 1968). The American Lutheran Church was included in the sampling in the last two studies.

In 1967 Paul Ramsey, Princeton social ethicist, sharply attacked the content of church social pronouncements and the methodology used in their development. He claims that the churches have no expertise in speaking too specifically, that their special wisdom lies in cultivating the political ethos of the nation and informing the consciences of its leaders. The concern of pronouncements, he suggests, should be the deepening and broadening of public debate on urgent questions, seeking to widen the range of legitimate options which are available to public officials. It is not the task of the churches to advance particular solutions to public problems and urge specific policy solutions. Thus he calls for "direction-oriented" rather than "directive-oriented" principles. Who Speaks for the Church? (Nashville: Abingdon, 1967). In the ensuing debate John Bennett and Roger Shinn agree with Ramsey's call for less specific policy guides in pronouncements, but contended that particular circumstances may warrant such specificity at times. Their response appear as "Paul Ramsey's Challenge to Ecumenical Ethics" (Shinn) and "A Critique of Paul Ramsey" (Bennett) in Christianity and Crisis, XXVII (October 30, 1967), 243-47 and 247-50.

Many church members dislike being identified with social policy statements with which they personally disagree. Others want the churches to speak and act only on those matters which have the overwhelming support of the membership. Others believe that religious groups tend to be overly cautious with respect to influencing public policy and urge more specific policy statements and action. Most members now probably agree that religious organizations should not advocate special privileges for their organization or their particular doctrines. Churches also are usually aware that they offer _a_ position and not necessarily _the_ _right_ position on an issue.

Today the major religious organizations respect government as a creative source of justice, freedom, and equality. They interact with the government on a wide range of problems, including education, social welfare, civil rights, issues of war and peace, and many others. Most churches refuse to observe the separationist wall between church and state and rather pursue a positive relation with the institutions of government.[1] These groups believe that they can advise the government on policies of common problems of public interest and that the churches and the government can cooperate in many areas.

---

[1] However, some religious groups support the separatist theme. The Baptist tradition is perhaps the best known defender of a sharp separation of church and state. Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State (POAU) and the National Association of Evangelicals are the chief active organizations. An informed treatment of this approach is found in Chapter 4, Separatism: Defenders of the Wall," in Sanders, _op. cit._, pp. 179-249.

Most mainline denominations have social education and action or church and society agencies within their national organizations.[1] These units are responsible for social education, the preparation of social policy statements, and the initiation of action projects designed to effect changes in the structure and laws of the community for a more just society. Many of these agencies also maintain offices in Washington.[2] The United Methodist Church, the United Church of Christ, the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., the Friends Committee on National Legislation, the Baptist Joint Union Committee on Public Affairs, the Religious Action Center of the Union of Hebrew American Congregations, the United States Catholic Conference, and a number of other religious groups maintain such offices. The major Lutheran churches, including the American Lutheran Church, are represented in Washington through the Office of Public Affairs of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. Most of the major Protestant denominations also are represented by the National Council of Churches, an alliance of Protestant and Orthodox churches with more than 40 million members. Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State and the American Council of Christian Churches also are represented in Washington.

---

[1] The information on the work of the churches' social education and action agencies described in this chapter and throughout the study was obtained primarily from personal discussions and contact with staff in these agencies over the past two and one-half years.

[2] Studies on the activities of churches in Washington include: Luke Ebersole, Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital (New York: Macmillan, 1951); Kenneth Vines, "The Role of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in the Formation of American National Policy" (Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1953); James A. Nash, "Church Lobbying in the Federal Government: A Comparative Study of Four Church Agencies in Washington" (Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Boston University, 1967); Richard Morgan, The Politics of Relgious Conflict (New York: Pegasus, 1968); and Paul Blanchard, God and Man in Washington (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960). The latter, unfortunately, suffers from an anti-Catholic bias. Additional information on the operation of the Washington offices was obtained from contact with those staffs in the course of the writer's work. Robert Van Deusen in the Washington Office of Public Affairs of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., and John Turnbull, associate director of the Washington Office of the National Council of Churches, were especially helpful.

Church groups generally have tended to avoid the term lobbying as descriptive of their activities. Certainly political action, or lobbying, does not represent any sizable part of the total activities of the churches. Interestingly, the 1950 House Committee investigating the role of interest groups in the legislative process observed that most such groups viewed their role as "educators" or "publishers" rather than "lobbying,"[1] and Ebersole found that most of the churches stressed the educational character of their Washington activities.[2] At the present time only the Friends Committee on National Legislation registers its staff as lobbyists. But there appears to be little formal pressure on the Congress by organized religious groups for specific bills, certainly nothing approaching the efforts of the veterans', business, farm and labor lobbies.[1]

---

[1] The Committee viewed the negative reaction of interest groups to the use of the term "lobby" as "protestations of injured innocence!" General Interim Report, op. cit., p. 29.

[2] Op. cit., p. 103.

However, most churches and church-related organizations today seek to influence public policy like other private interest groups. James Nash in his recent study of church lobbying in Washington showed that church groups use most of the lobbying methods employed by other organizations, except for lavish spending on entertainment or public relations campaigns.[2] Nash noted that the only new method adopted by the churches in recent years has been an increase in the use of volunteer constituents for lobbying purposes. He also observed that church political action appears to differ from other private interest groups only in the rationale for action. Church lobbying, he found, tended to be almost exclusively other-oriented in character, concerned primarily with the welfare of others, either the general welfare or the welfare of particular groups, especially the underprivileged and powerless.[3]

In the late 1960's there was a notable upgrading in Washington political activity by the churches.[4] Since the formation of the Washington Inter-religious Staff Conference in 1967, the staff persons in the Washington denominational offices seek to be more of an active coalition. In addition to the development of strategy for legislative influence, the Staff Conference also directs two programs. One is an annual legislative conference designed to brief selected church members on specific issues and to assist them in visiting their congressmen. The other is the establishment of IMPACT, a legislative response network reaching into more than one hundred congressional districts. The latter program seeks to organize support for federal legislative action.

---

[1] Blaisdell, op. cit., pp. 100-101.

[2] Op. cit., p. 152ff. Nash's study is based upon an analysis and comparison of the Washington Office of the National Council of Churches, the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the United Methodist Church, the Washington Office of the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ, and the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

[3] Ibid., p. 228ff.

[4] Interviews with John Turnbull, associate director of the Washington Office of the National Council of Churches, and Robert Van Deusen, director of the Washington Office of Public Affairs of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., on October 27 and 28, 1969, respectively.

While the extent of involvement in lobbying activities varies, the Washington representatives of the churches seek to keep their members informed on current political developments, to inform public officials of denominational pronouncements, to provide testimony at hearings where the issues under discussion relate to a pronouncement, and to solicit support for or against governmental action which is considered important to the aims and purposes of the religious group. John Turnbull, associate director of the Washington Office of the National Council of Churches, estimates that his office devotes approximately 30% of its time to personal contact with legislators and administrators, 10% to hearings, 40% to coalitions and development of strategy, and the balance to communications with member churches. His office directs about 75% of its efforts toward the legislative branch, 20% toward the executive branch, and less than 5% toward the judicial branch. Robert Van Deusen, director of the

XUM

Office of Public Affairs of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. in Washington, divides his time giving approximately 20% to personal contacts, 10% to hearings, 20% to coalitions and strategy planning, and 50% to internal communication.

Most of the "mainline" Protestant churches in America now participate in the public policy-making process with a fairly high degree of political realism. The churches realize that they can operate as creative forces for political change only by engaging in direct efforts to influence the decisions of government officials in ways comparable to other interest groups in society. As such they share the transformationist attitude toward church-state relations. Chapter III considers the development of Lutheran political thought and its potential for political action today.

Chapter III

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY IN THE LUTHERAN TRADITION

The Lutheran tradition has been variously interpreted with respect to its influence upon social and political developments since the Reformation and its significance for our day.[1] Ernst Troeltsch in his monumental work, The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches, traced the "cultural quietism" and "social conservatism" of the Lutheran Church in Germany directly to Luther.[2] Reinhold Niebuhr, following Troeltsch, locates the source of Lutheran quietism in the "rigorous dualism" of Luther's social ethic.[3] Other writers attribute the development of National Socialism to Luther.[4] On the other hand,

---

[1] Cf. George Forell, Faith Active in Love (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1954), pp. 16-25. This study provides a very useful introduction to the various interpretations of Luther. Cf. also Wilhelm Pauck, The Heritage of the Reformation, rev. ed. (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), p. 4f.

[2] The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, Vol. II, translated by Olive Wyon (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1931), pp. 523-76.

[3] The Nature and Destiny of Man, Vol. II (New York: Scribners, 1949), p. 193.

[4] Cf. William Shirer, The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich (Greenwich: Fawcett Crest, 1960); Peter Wiener, Martin Luther: Hitler's Spiritual Ancestor (London: Hutchinson, 1945); and William McGovern, From Luther to Hitler (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1941).

Bishop Berggrav of Norway, placed under house arrest by the German occupation forces during the Second World War, has acclaimed Luther as the "liberator" against Nazism.[1]

Much of the difficulty of interpreting Luther lies in the fact that he was not a systematic writer or even primarily concerned with political questions. Luther was essentially a theologian and his political comments were addressed to particular situations; he was an existential rather than an abstract writer. An examination of his writings reveals an overriding religious concern. Luther was primarily a teacher of the church rather than a political reformer or a liberal or a tyrant. This rather simple and yet basic observation is often ignored when interpretations are made of his political thought. "Those who criticize Luther's position from the point of view of modern political liberalism or Marxism and attack him as a political reactionary because he chose to be a religious rather than a political leader, accuse him essentially of being Luther rather than Karl Marx.[2] In Luther the problems of government are subordinated and secondary to his religious concern. Lutheran history witnesses this same basic concern. Nevertheless, this focus upon religious concern has had important political and social ramifications.

---

[1] Man and State [1945], translated by George Aus (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1951).

[2] Forell, op. cit., p. 162. Heinrich Bornkamm writes: "Luther was neither a statesman nor a political philosopher but a preacher of the Gospel. . . . Luther's pronouncements on questions of political and national life are all spiritual counsel, the application of the Word of God to the activities of men sharing in the order of civic life. . . ." Luther's World of Thought (St. Louis: Concordia, 1958), p. 237.

Luther's Political Thought

Central to Luther's understanding of government is the distinction between the "two kingdoms." Luther used this image to distinguish between God's two-fold rule by means of law and gospel.[1] The "two kingdoms" does not refer to the sociological division between church and state, even though the former is responsible for preaching the gospel and the latter for maintaining order and justice. "It is rather two relationships in which man stands with regard to his total life and activity."[2] The one refers to his relationship with God and the other his relations with men. The "two kingdoms" points to concurrent or "simultaneous modes of divine rule and human response,"[3] distinguishing between man's response in faith to God and his life in community in all its structured forms. Man's relationship to God is determined by the gospel and faith; here God carries out his work of redemption and sanctification through his Word in the hearts of men. His relations to men are directed by law and reason; in this area God maintains his work of creation and preservation. In Luther's words:

---

[1] Edgar Carlson insists that this is "the point from which he constantly proceeds and to which he constantly returns." "Luther's Conception of Government," Church History, XV (December, 1946), 258.

[2] Edgar Carlson, The Church and the Public Conscience (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1956), p. 30.

[3] Helmut Thielicke, Theological Ethics, Vol. II, translated by William H. Lazareth (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), p. 372. Thielicke accepts this interpretation by Törnvall as a correct interpretation of Luther. It should be noted, however, that he believes the New Testament view of the realms (aeons) is successive rather than simultaneous. Other useful sources for the "two kingdoms" in addition to Thielicke are:

> The one is spiritual; it has no sword, but it has the word, by means of which men are to become good and righteous, so that with this righteousness they may attain eternal life. He administers this righteousness through the word, which he has committed to the preachers. The other kind is worldly government, which works through the sword so that those who do not want to be good and righteous to eternal life may be forced to become good and righteous in the eyes of the world. He administers this righteousness through the sword. And although God will not reward this kind of righteousness with eternal life, nonetheless, he still wishes peace to be maintained among men and rewards them with temporal blessings. He gives rulers much more property, honor, and power than he gives to others so that they may serve him by administering this temporal righteousness. Thus God himself is the founder, lord, master, protector, and rewarder of both kinds of righteousness. There is no human ordinance or authority in either, but each is a divine thing entirely.[1]

Edgar Carlson, The Church and the Public Conscience, op. cit.; and "The Two Realms and the Modern World," The Lutheran World XII (No. 4, 1965), 373-83; F. Edward Cranz, An Essay on the Development of Luther's Thought on Justice, Law, and Society ("Harvard Theological Studies," V. XIX; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959); Forell, op. cit.; Lazareth, Luther on the Christian Home (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1960), especially Chapter 4, and "The 'Two Kingdoms' Reconsidered," Dialog, I (Autumn, 1962), 30-35; Anders Nygren, "Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," The Ecumenical Review, I (No. 3, 1949), 301-10; and Franz Lau, "The Lutheran Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," The Lutheran World, XII (No. 4, 1965), 355-72.

[1] Whether Soldiers, Too, Can Be Saved in Luther's Works, American ed., Vol. XXXVI (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), pp. 99-100. T. F. Torrence has noted that under the "two kingdoms," God's two-fold rule is "differentiated and yet unified under the overarching Regnum Dei." Kingdom and Church (Edinburgh:

Luther applied this concept of the "two kingdoms" to the work of both church and government. He rejected ecclesiastical control over the government as a distortion of God's intention. The latter received its mandate from God directly and not from the church. Government and the church each are instruments of God for specific purposes, and neither is to infringe upon the legitimate task of the other. It was for this reason that Luther calls upon the princes to assume their rightful authority as wielders of the sword and to exercise their responsibility independently of ecclesiastical control. Luther thus justified the independence of the government from the church, but still held it accountable to God. As for the church, it was to operate in both "kingdoms." Its task of proclaiming the Word relates to the work of the gospel; at the same time, however, as an institution in society it was to operate according to reason and be responsible to the laws established by the government.

Luther located the basis of government in Romans 13: "Let every soul be subject to the governing authority, for

---

Oliver and Boyd, 1956), p. 32. Anders Nygren has emphasized: "It should be noted that it is God Himself who rules in both these realms. He never drops the reins. To speak of either is thus to speak of a kingdom which is God's, and it is with Him that we deal in matters spiritual and temporal both. This realization is all important. We are sometimes in danger of looking on the temporal as something profane, as if God were active only in the spiritual. The temporal is not foreign to God, and Luther does not regard it as such. To him there is nothing which is profane, and no sphere in which God is not at work." "Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," _op._ _cit._, p. 304.

there is no authority except from God: The authority which everywhere exists has been ordained by God. He therefore who resists the governing authority resists the ordinance of God, and he who resists God's ordinance will incure judgment.[1] He also pointed to I Peter 2:13-14, which notes that rulers "have been sent by [God] to punish the wicked and to praise the righteous." The scope of government is the temporal needs of men, over "life and property and external offices on earth. . . ."[2] Its proper instrument is the sword, which "is turned only against the wicked, to hold them in check and keep them at peace, and to protect and save the righteous. . . ."[3]

Luther viewed war as a necessary evil, as a means for the repression of wrong. When used for that purpose it is justifiable.[4] One can even describe it as an instrument of

---

[1] Cf. Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Ought to Be Obeyed in Luther's Works, American ed., Vol. XXXV (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1962), pp. 89-129.

[2] Ibid., p. 105.

[3] An Open Letter on the Harsh Book Against the Peasants in Luther's Works, American ed., Vol. XXXVI, op. cit., p. 70. Earlier he states: "But the kingdom of the world is a kingdom of wrath and severity. In it there is only punishment, repression, judgment, and condemnation, to restrict the wicked and protect the good. For this reason it has the sword, and Sceipture calls a prince or lord 'God's wrath,' or 'God's rod' (Is. 14)." Pp. 69-70.

[4] "Now slaying and robbing do not seem to be works of love. A simple man therefore does not think it is a Christian thing to do. In truth, however, even this is a work of love. For example, a good doctor sometimes finds so serious and terrible a sickness that he must amputate or destroy a hand, foot, ear, eye, to save the body. . . . In the same way, when I think of a soldier fulfilling his office by punishing the wicked, killing the wicked, and creating so much misery, it seems an un-Christian work completely contrary to Christian love.

God because of the greater evil that it prevents.[1] However, there are limits to the kinds of war that may be fought. Insofar as war is for the prevention or punishment of wrong, aggressive wars are always wrong.[2]

Luther considered law and reason as the proper guides for government activity, and assumed the basis of all law in natural law. He noted that there is no specifically Christian revelation in the area of natural law and recommended that Christians make use of the insights of Aristotle and Cicero. However, he does call for a tempering of law with justice because of the demonic element which seeks to distort its application.[3] The scope of law is limited to the legitimate

---

But when I think of how it protects the good and keeps and preserves wife and child, house and farm, property, and honor and peace, then I see how precious and godly this work is. . . . Therefore, such a war is only a very brief lack of peace that prevents an everlasting and immeasurable lack of peace, a small misfortune that prevents a great misfortune." Whether Soldiers, Too, Can Be Saved, op. cit., p. 96.

[1] "The small lack of peace called war or the sword must set a limit to this universal, worldwide lack of peace which would destroy everyone. . . .This is why God honors the sword so highly that he says that he himself has instituted it (Rom. 13:1) and does not want men to say or think that they have invented it or instituted it. For the hand that wields this sword and kills with it is not man's hand, but God's; and it is not man, but God, who hangs, tortures, beheads, kills, and fights. All these are God's works and judgments." Ibid.

[2] "Worldly government has not been instituted by God to break the peace and start war, but to maintain peace and to avoid war." Ibid., p. 118.

[3] Ibid., p. 101ff.

concerns of the political community.[1]

The mandate of government rests on the office of the magistrate, that is, the prince, emperor, or other occupant of a political office. Luther held this office in very high esteem, and once said that "temporal government next to the preaching office, is the highest service of God and the most useful office on earth."[2] The duties of the ruler were "to punish and judge evil men, to vindicate and defend the oppressed, because it is not they but God who does this. They are his servants in this matter. . . ."[3] The office of the ruler was to implement the purposes of government. Luther did not prescribe the procedures of ruling, but rather attempted to "simply instruct [the prince's] heart and mind on what his attitude should be toward all laws, counsel, judgments and actions."[4] His concern was how the prince exercised his authority, not so much what his authority was, "If he governs himself accordingly, God will surely grant him the ability to carry out all laws, counsels, and actions in a proper and godly way."[1]

---

[1] "The temporal government has laws which extend no further than to life and property and external affairs on earth, for God cannot and will not permit anyone but himself to rule over the soul. Therefore when the temporal authority presumes to prescribe laws for the soul, it encroaches upon God's government and only misleads souls and destroys them. . . . How he believes or disbelieves is a matter for the conscience of each individual, and since this takes nothing away from the temporal authority the latter should be content to attend to its own affairs and let men believe this or that as they are able and willing, and constrain no one by force." Temporal Authority, op. cit., p. 90.

[2] Exposition of the 82nd Psalm in Works of Martin Luther, Philadelphia ed., Vol. IV (Philadelphia: Holman and Castle Press, 1931), p. 298.

[3] Two Kinds of Righteousness in Luther's Works, American ed., Vol. XXI (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1957), p. 305.

[4] Temporal Authority, op. cit., p. 120.

But while Luther thus emphasized the divine mandate to the ruler, he did not countenance absolutism. "[T]hey are not gods among the people. . .in such a way that they have their position all to themselves and can do as they like. Nay, not so! God Himself is there also, and He will judge, punish, and master them, and if they do not obey him, they shall not escape."[2] The only general limitation to obedience that Luther recognized, however, was when the ruler attempted to cause the subject to violate his conscience. No one can be required to obey an evil command, or even to participate in an unwarranted war.[3] In either case, one must refuse and suffer the consequences that such disobedience will bring. Luther allowed only passive disobedience. If anyone was uncertain over the rightness of a course of action, the benefit of doubt was to be given the ruler.[1] The only other check upon excesses by the ruler was public admonitions from the clergy.[2] The ineffectiveness of this restraint upon a recalcitrant ruler is evident, however, inasmuch as a pastor was always subject to dismissal by his ruler.[3]

---

[1] Ibid. Luther outlines four tasks for the Christian prince: "First, toward God there must be true confidence and earnest prayer; second, toward his subjects there must be love and Christian service; third, with respect to his counselors and officials, he must maintain an untrammeled reason and unfettered judgment; fourth, with respect to evil doers, he must manifest a restrained severity and firmness. Then the prince's job will be done right, both outwardly and inwardly; it will be pleasing to God and to the people." P. 126.

[2] Exposition on the 82nd Psalm, op. cit., pp. 291-92. In the same manner he called the prince to responsibility before God in An Open Letter Concerning the Hard Book Against the Peasants.

[3] "If you know for sure that he [i.e., the ruler] is wrong, then you should fear God rather than men, Acts 4 (5:29), and you should neither fight nor serve, for you cannot have a good conscience before God." Whether Soldiers, Too, Can Be Saved, op. cit., p. 130.

A recurring problem in the interpretation of Luther is his understanding of the responsibility of the ruler in regard to the maintenance of orthodox religious belief. He called upon the Christian princes to take the initiative in the reform of the church.[4] Believing that Rome was "mixing" the "kingdoms" by exercising civil authority, he urged the princes to accept their divine mandate for exclusive use of political power. However, they were not to reform doctrine as such, as the latter was a responsibility of the church. Heresy also was outside the jurisdiction of the prince.[1] Rather when it came to religious belief, the ruler's function was to prevent the teaching of sedition and rebellion. The difficulty, of course, comes in distinguishing between heresy and sedition.[2]

---

[1] "But if you do not know, or cannot find out whether your lord is wrong, you ought not weaken an uncertain obedience with an uncertainty of right, but should think the best of your lord. . . ." Ibid.

[2] In a Table Talk he is recorded as saying: "[A]lthough [government] is a divine institution, God has reserved the right to punish vices and correct wrong. Accordingly one should rebuke secular rulers if they allow the goods of their poor subjects to be drained off or ruined by usury or bad government. But it is not proper for a preacher to prescribe measures and say at what price bread, meat, etc., shall be sold and valued." Theodore Tappert, ed., Luther: Letters of Spiritual Counsel ("Library of Christian Classics," Vol. XVIII; London: SCM Press, 1955), p. 335.

[3] Ibid., p. 348.

[4] To the Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Reform of the Christian Estate in Luther's Works, American ed., Vol. XXXIV (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), pp. 123-217.

Luther emphasized that the office of ruler is God-given and hence God-ordained. It therefore follows that each person must be obedient to his ruler. Luther regarded every action of obedience to his ruler as implying a definite relationship to God, as if the obedience were to God himself.[3] This obedience is due even the unjust ruler.[4] Luther believed

---

[1] "Heresy can never be restrained by force. . . . Here God's Word must do the fighting. If it does not succeed, certainly the temporal power will not succeed either, even if it were to drench the world in blood. . . ." Temporal Authority, op. cit., p. 114.

[2] Luther continued to uphold the punishment of heretics advocating disobedience to any form of public order. Cf. Exposition of the 82nd Psalm, op. cit., p. 309. But he also urged the punishment of those denying "an article of faith clearly grounded in Scripture and believed throughout the whole Church. . . ." P. 310.

[3] Luther emphasized that the office of ruler is God-given and hence God-ordained. It therefore follows that man must be obedient towards his ruler. Luther regarded every act of obedience to the ruler as implying a definite relationship to God, as if the obedience were unto God himself. "He who would resist them or be disobedient to them or despise them, whom God names with His own name and calls gods, and to whom He attaches His own honor; he, I say, who despises, disobeys, or resists them, is thereby despising, disobeying and resisting the true Supreme God, who is in them, and speaks and judges through them and calls their judgment His judgment." Ibid., p. 290.

[4] "Even though the rulers are evil and unbelieving the order of government and their power to rule are nevertheless good and from God. Just as our Lord said to Pilot, to whom he was willing to surrender in order to give us all an example, 'You could have no power against me, unless it were given you from above.'" Lectures on Romans 13 in Wilhelm Pauck, Luther:

XUM

that any punishment that is to be given to the unjust ruler must come from God himself.[1] The power of the sword was restricted to the office of the ruler. Luther contended that if subjects asserted the right to punish a wicked ruler, insurrection and anarchy would be the end result.[2] In fact, this danger from mob rule was seen as far greater than suffering under tyranny.[3] For this reason, "a wicked tyrant is more tolerable than a bad war."[4] Accordingly, God has reserved the

---

Lectures on Romans ("Library of Christian Classics," Vol. XV; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), p. 358. Thus Luther reasoned that a ruler deserves obedience "even when the government commits an injustice, as the King of Babylon did to the people of Israel," because harsh rule may simply be God's hand of punishment. Moreover, obedience ought be given because "the power of the temporal authority, whether it does right or wrong, cannot harm the soul, but only our body and our property--unless, of course, it should try openly to compel us to do wrong against God or men. . . ." Treatise on Good Works in Luther's Works, American ed., Vol. XXXIV, op. cit., p. 92.

[1] Exposition on the 82nd Psalm, op. cit., p. 291.

[2] Rebellion is "an unprofitable method of procedure. It never brings about the desired improvement. For insurrection lacks discernment; it generally harms the innocent more than the guilty. Hence, no insurrection is ever right, no matter how right the cause it seeks to promote. . . . I am and always will be on the side of those against whom insurrection is directed, no matter how unjust their cause; I am opposed to those who rise in insurrection, no matter how just their cause, because there can be no insurrection without hurting the innocent and shedding their blood." Admonition to Guard Against Revolution and Rebellion in Luther's Works, American ed., Vol. XXXIV, op. cit., pp. 62-63.

[3] "If it is considered right to murder or depose tyrants, the practice spreads and it becomes a commonplace thing arbitrarily to call men tyrants who are not tyrants. . . . The mob neither has any moderation nor even knows what moderation is. And every person in it has more than five tyrants hiding in him." Whether Soldiers, Too, Can Be Saved, op. cit., pp. 105-106.

[4] Ibid., p. 109.

prerogative of punishment for his own use.

These issues involved Luther in the controversy surrounding the Peasants' Revolt. His opposition charged that the rebellion was nothing more than the outward expression of his teachings. But Luther insisted that however legitimate the social grievances of the peasants, the kingdom of God under whose authority they claimed redress did not permit the use of the sword.[1] He considered such an appeal a "mixing" of the "kingdoms." If the peasants really desired to be Christians, obedience was required of them because of God's grant of the sword to the rulers. This subservience also included the relationship between a subordinate ruler and his superior.[2]

Obedience, then, characterized the responsibility of the subject to his ruler. According to Luther, God had given the power of political authority to the office of magistrate and demanded obedience on the part of subjects as a test of obedience to himself. Obedience was due even to an unjust ruler, for this was less dangerous to public order than the consequences of rebellion and anarchy. God reserved the punishment of rulers to himself. The only cause which justified disobedience for Luther was resistance to a command which violated conscience. But even the limit of disobedience was passive. And one also had to accept passively any subsequent punishment

---

1. Admonition to Peace in Luther's Works, American ed., Vol. XXXVI, op. cit., pp. 17-43.

2. Whether Soldiers, Too, Can Be Saved, op. cit., p. 126.

given by the ruler.

According to Luther, the divinely-instituted civil authority is subdivided into a number of "offices" or "callings."[1] Every person has an office in life, for example, as a ruler, a housewife, a teacher, etc. These are the "masks" of God, understood as such by Christians, through which God contains the creative and destructive forces in man. It is through these offices that the Christian, including the prince, relates love to his neighbor's need. The basis of Luther's ethics has been described as "faith active in love."[2] Luther believed that faith freed the Christian for spontaneous service to the needs of the neighbor. This service, however, also was to be performed in public life. Luther's defense of the offices was not to endorse the _status quo_, but to affirm the freedom of the Christian to live out his life in a creative manner in whatever situation he found himself. The effect although not the purpose of this focus on the creative life of the individual to the neglect of the justice of the established offices, however, was to endorse the _status quo_.

Luther's views on government and political responsibility were incorporated into the Augsburg Confession in 1530, a common Lutheran statement presented to Charles V. While the Augsburg Confession was not prepared by Luther, he was consulted in its formulation. Articles 16, 18, and 28 refer to social and political life.[1] Article 28 relates to the concept of the "two kingdoms":

---

[1] Cf. Forell, _op. cit._, p. 122ff.

[2] Cf. Forell, _op. cit._

> This power of keys or of bishops is used and exercised only by teaching and preaching the Word of God and by administering the sacraments. . . . Temporal authority is concerned with matters altogether different from the Gospel. Temporal authority does not protect the soul, but with the sword and physical penalties it protects body and goods from the power of others.

Therefore, it notes, "the two authorities, the spiritual and the temporal, are not to be mingled or confused, for the spiritual power has its commission to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments." Both authorities are to "be held in honor as the highest gifts of God on earth."

Article 16, referring to civil government, states that

> all government in the world and all established rule and laws were instituted and ordained by God for the sake of good order, and that Christians may without sin occupy civil offices or serve as princes and judges, render decisions and pass sentence according to imperial and other existing laws, punish evildoers with the sword, engage in just wars, serve as soldiers, buy and sell, take required oaths, possess property, be married, etc.

Furthermore:

> The Gospel does not overthrow civil authority, the state, and marriage but requires that all these be kept as true orders of God and that everyone, each according to his own calling, manifest Christian love and genuine good works in his station of life. Accordingly Christians are obliged to be subject to civil authority and obey its commands and laws in all that can be done without sin. But when commands of the civil authority cannot be obeyed without sin, we must obey God rather than men (Acts 5:29).

---

[1] The Book of Concord, translated and edited by Theodore Tappert (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1959), pp. 23-96. The references herein are taken from the German translation.

Finally, in Article 18 the Confession affirms civic righteousness. "It is also taught among us that man possesses some measure of freedom of the will which enables him to live an outwardly honorable life and to make choices among the things that reason comprehends." Quoting St. Augustine, it holds that "'all men have a free will, for all have a natural, innate understanding and reason. However, this does not enable them to act in matters pertaining to God (such as loving God with their whole heart or fearing him), for it is only in the outward act of this life that they have freedom to choose good or evil.'"

Political Responsibility in the Development of Lutheranism

Luther turned to the princes for leadership in the reform of the church when the religious authorities failed to act.[1] The pattern which emerged in the areas controlled by Lutheran princes was a system of consistories appointed by the ruler in each territory which functioned to punish gross immorality, promote religious conformity, and determine ecclesiastical organization. Luther insisted on the temporary character of the consistories, but eventually they became the accepted vehicle through which the princes controlled the religious life in their areas. Thus, "[i]n theory, the church was ruled by Christ and the Word; in practice it was governed by the ruling princes and the pastors. By accepting political control over the church as an emergency measure, the German Reformation deprived itself of the opportunity to establish structures by which it would maintain its full independence."[1] Troeltsch notes that this was "the beginning of the social impotence of Lutheranism."[2] Eventually it would lead to Lutheranism's "historical paralysis."[3]

---

[1] Among the more helpful sources consulted for this historical survey were: Harold Grimm, The Reformation Era, 1500-1650 New York: Macmillan, 1954); Harold Letts, ed., The Lutheran Heritage, op. cit., Ernst Troeltsch, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, op. cit., and James Nichols, History of Christianity, 1650-1950 (New York: Ronald Press, 1956).

Gradually Lutheranism tended to give unquestioned obedience to all government authorities. During the seventeenth century, the sharp criticism of the rulers which Luther had made was almost entirely silenced, the status quo was supported and sanctioned, and "the responsibility of the citizens was in effect reduced to blind obedience."[4] As described by Troeltsch, "the tension between public and private morality disappeared more and more, and there arose that type which is usually described as Lutheran: that is, unconditional obedience towards the central government, and the subordinate officials, both of whom represent God, and only hold their office by virtue of God's permission. . . ."[1] With the emergence of Pietism and its focus on inward spirituality in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Lutheranism for the most part abdicated responsibility for political and social problems. By the end of the eighteenth century "the churches had become tools of secular policy in the absolute states of Germany."[2]

---

[1] Sanders, op. cit., p. 54. Nichols states: "By the end of the religious wars the emergency system had become established, and the princes claimed the rights and functions of the pre-Reformation Catholic bishops as their due prerogative. Sometimes the argument was specifically made that in protestant areas these rights had legally devolved upon them. But these Protestant 'bishops' were now above the limitations of canon law." Op. cit., p. 46.

[2] Op. cit., p. 563.

[3] Wolfgang Trillhaas, "The Contributions of Lutheranism to Social Ethics Today" in Faith and Society: Toward A Contemporary Social Ethic, supplement to The Lutheran World, XIII (No. 2, 1966), 56f.

[4] Theodore Tappert, "Orthodoxy, Pietism and Rationalism, 1580-1830" in Letts, The Lutheran Heritage, op. cit., p. 55f.

During this development, however, Lutheranism was not totally devoid of social concern. Luther's interest in social welfare and the care of the poor was continued in the church. The period of Pietism witnessed the founding of numerous schools and social service agencies. In the nineteenth century, the Inner Mission movement had as its primary concern the assumption by the church of interest and involvement in social service. But the Inner Mission movement did not change the basic outlook of Lutheranism. Neither the church nor the political rulers were ready for such activity.[3] In fact, by the late nineteenth century the movement had become increasingly conservative as it gained ecclesiastical support, and its anti-Social Democrat position prevented it from reconciling the disenchanted workers with the church.[1] Troeltsch, writing in the early part of the present century, concluded that "the Lutheran Church has never advanced farther than the renewed ideal of charity; it has never made any effort to initiate a real social transformation at all. Most Lutherans simply repeat the old doctrine of the inwardness of the Church and of the duty of leaving all external matters of legislation and social welfare to the State.[2]

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 553.

[2] Nichols, op. cit., p. 52.

[3] Troeltsch, op. cit., pp. 567-68. Cf. E. Theodore Bachmann, "The Church and the Rise of Modern Society, 1830-1914" in Letts, The Lutheran Heritage, op. cit., p. 105.

This, in fact, was the practical effect of the teachings of Julius Stahl who greatly influenced the German Lutherans in the mid-nineteenth century. He argued that both church and state are authoritarian instruments of God requiring child-like obedience, the church having no responsibility for political and social issues. Stahl thus gave the conservative political forces a political theology, wedding "throne and altar."[3] He and other Lutherans provided considerable theological justification for the political inactivity of the church in the face of National Socialism in Germany in the twentieth century.

Troeltsch observes, on the basis of the German development, that although Lutheranism had no theoretical tendency toward monarchy or absolutism, "by its renunciation of ecclesiastical independents, by its deification of the Government and its loyal passivity, it provided a most favourable setting for the development of the territorial State, which was then engaged in the process of self-development. It smoothed the way for territorial absolutism. . . ."[1] The church relied upon whatever power was dominant at the time and "adapt[ed] itself most easily to political conditions of a monarchial and autocratic kind, and to an economic social situation which [was] predominantly agrarian and middle class."[2] It might be noted, however, that the German pattern of church subordination to civil authority did not characterize Lutheran development in Scandinavia, where the bishops established a considerable degree of independence from the monarchy.[3] In any case, circumstances generally

---

[1] Bachmann, op. cit., p. 126ff.

[2] Op. cit., p. 568.

[3] Bachmann, op. cit., p. 100.

> had more effect than religion upon the political theories of religious bodies. Rather one might say that for all Protestants religion transcended politics and the chief concern was to give free course to the Word of God. Just as the Catholic Church will make a concordat with any regime which allows freedom to administer the sacraments, freedom to propagate the faith, freedom to hold property, and freedom for the monastic orders, so Protestantism has been willing to tolerate any form of government which accords religious liberty to Protestantism.[4]

Lutheranism in the twentieth century is now experiencing

---

1. Op. cit., p. 572.

2. Ibid., p. 575.

3. Edgar Carlson, The Reinterpretation of Luther (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1948), p. 15ff.

4. Roland Bainton, The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century (Boston: Beacon Press, 1952), p. 234.

a reawakening of its social and political responsibility.[1] The trauma of the two world wars has shocked Lutherans into a reexamination of the roots of their heritage in order to recover dimensions of the tradition which became obscured in the historical development. The challenge of Nazism and Communism presented the problem of the totalitarian state in contrast to Luther's confrontation with a totalitarian church, causing Lutherans to consider more carefully those elements in Luther's thought which caution against uncritical obedience. The next chapter will consider the social and political renewal of Lutheranism in this country.

A Contemporary Evaluation

The world today is very different from Luther's world of the sixteenth century. Some of the changes came concurrently with the Reformation; others came later. Capitalism and nationalism were developing prior to the entrance of Luther upon the stage of history. Catholic monarchs in France were gradually establishing a degree of independence from Rome, and the princes in Germany had already gained semi-independence for their respective territories.[2] The meaning of these trends for the Reformation is indeed complex.[1] Today ideas concerning religious pluralism, democracy, representation and voting, inform our political habits, and the institutions and functions of government have undergone remarkable changes. In Luther's day the modern distinction between public and private affairs was less clear, defense of the realm was largely in the hands of private individuals, law was almost entirely private law, individual rights tended to be stated in terms of property rights, and treaties were respected because they were similar to contracts between individuals.[2]

---

[1] Cf. William H. Lazareth, "The Twentieth Century Recovery of Lutheran Political Responsibility" in The Ethics of Power: The Interplay of Religion, Philosophy, and Politics, edited by Harold Lasswell and Harlan Cleveland (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), pp. 119-39.

[2] Cf. Forell, op. cit., pp. 26-43.

The change in all these conditions raises new questions for Lutherans today. How helpful is the Lutheran understanding of the "two kingdoms" for a contemporary understanding of church-state relations? What is the basis of civil authority in a democratic society? How well did Luther and subsequent Lutherans understand the political processes of the state? How adequately did Luther relate love and justice as guides for political and civic responsibility? As one writer has stated,

> Lutherans of today do not presume that Luther has done all of their theological and political thinking

---

[1] An analysis of the social, economic, and intellectual forces of the sixteenth century is included in Grim, op. cit., Chapters 1 and 2, and Bainton, op. cit., Chapter 12. The interaction of Reformation thought and socio-economic developments also has been treated in H. Richard Niebuhr, The Social Sources of Denominationalism (New York: Meriden, 1929); Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism [1904, 1905], translated by Talcott Parsons (New York: Scribners, 1958); and R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1926).

[2] Ronald Young, American Law and Politics (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), pp. 11-12.

> for them, or that his teachings are a necessary rule and guide for them. Where Luther is wrong or archaic in terms of today, he is relegated to a historical curiosity because Lutheranism, for the most part, has tried to be objective and critical about Luther.[1]

The following critique considers some of the basic problems in Lutheranism's political ethics and indicates some of the current efforts at reappraisal of the tradition.

One of the major weaknesses in Luther's thought is the inadequate attention he gave to the problem of effective control of the exercise of civil authority. His exhortations to civil obedience, and, at most, passive civil disobedience appear naive. It seems strange that Luther, who had such insight into the nature of sin, subjected the ruler only to the threat of divine retribution for unjust rule. Even a Christian ruler is subject to perversions of self-will; how much more the arbitrary action of a ruler intent upon personal gain! Historical necessities may indeed have required him to seek the assistance of the princes for religious reform. His thought indicates, however, that he relied upon the commitment to natural law to control the rulers. In any case, he offered no justification for effective political opposition to rulers who disregarded the natural law. As a result, Lutheranism, having become an appendage of government in Germany, was relatively helpless before the onslaught of totalitarian government in the twentieth century. As one writer asks: "Why cannot it be admitted that

---

[1] George Hall, "Church and State" in What Lutherans Are Thinking, edited by E. C. Fendt (Columbus: Wartburg, 1947), p. 513.

Luther was less on guard against the political rulers than he was against the Pope and the Roman Church and that he is not necessarily a good guide in dealing with the threat from political tyranny when it is much greater than the threat from ecclesiastical tyranny?"[1] Probably due to his fear of revolution and anarchy, Luther subordinated concern for social and political justice to a concern for political and social order. He

> failed to understand that the road to princely absolutism, as it developed in the seventeenth century, became unblocked as soon as subjects were taught convincingly that social and political stability deserved to be paid for in the coin of yielding to new injustices. While it must be said that Luther did not ignore the issue of justice and order, it ought to be admitted that his practical decisions weigh the scales in favor of the latter.[2]

The continued usefulness of the "two kingdoms" concept lies in its further development and application to the work of government as well as to the responsibility of the church. Since the beginning of the Second World War, a number of Lutheran scholars have attempted to reformulate the Lutheran position. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the young Lutheran theologian, introduced the possibility of tyrannicide into Lutheran political ethics by his participation in the attempted plot on Hitler's life. Bishop Berggrav of Norway reinterpreted Romans 13 as advocating obedience to authority insofar as it is subject to law.[1] Submission to unlawful authority was not required of Christians. Gunnar Hillerdahl, the Swedish theologian, thought that the kind of absolute obedience implied in Romans 13 was contrary to responsible citizenship in the modern democratic state.[2] In this country, one of the more helpful studies in this regard is a document outlining the interaction of religion and law in a pluralistic society prepared by American Lutherans under the initial direction of the former United Lutheran Church in America.[3] Rejecting a "wall of separation" model for church-state relations which serves to make the state autonomous, the United Lutheran Church study supports a position of "institutional separation" and "functional interaction" of church and state as consistant with Luther's theological intention. Lutheranism, therefore, is beginning to reapply the "two kingdoms" concept to the problems of excessive political power and the responsibility of citizenship in democratic society.

---

[1] Comments by John C. Bennett on Lazareth, "The Twentieth Century Recovery of Lutheran Political Responsibility," op. cit. p. 140.

[2] Herman Klann, "Luther's Political Ethics: An Investigation of His Principles" (Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Columbia University, 1951), pp. 332-33.

In the Lutheran tradition the problem of effective control of power is probably paralleled in importance by the problem of relating love to justice. Niebuhr, following

---

[1] Cf. Man and State, _op. cit._

[2] Gehorsam gegen Gott und Menchen, p. 295. Cited by Sanders, _op. cit._, p. 62.

[3] _Church and State: A Lutheran Perspective_ (New York: Board of Social Ministry, Lutheran Church in America, 1963).

Troeltsch, has argued:

> In Luther's doctrine of the Two Realms, justice is consigned completely to the realm of the law. There "nothing is known of law, conscience, or sword." The law, in such a rigorous dualism, does not even contain within it the desire to do justice. It is no more than a coercive arrangement which prevents mutual harm. Love, on the other hand, is only Agape in its purest and most unadulterated form, which means in a form in which it is known in human experience only in rare moments of evangelical fervor or crisis heroism. This is why the Lutheran formulation of the relation of love to law is so irrelevant to the broad area of common experience in which one must balance claims and counterclaims and make discriminate judgments about competing interests.[1]

The heart of Niebuhr's criticism of Lutheran political ethics is the latter's inability to define consistent criteria for the achievement of relative justice.[2] Without such criteria, love and reason are separated in a Kantian dualism of personal and social ethics, love enhancing personal relations but having nothing to say about political life.

---

[1] *Christian Realism and Political Problems* (New York: Scribners, 1953), pp. 162-63. The Peasants' Revolt is an excellent example of this problem. Luther admonished the peasants not to confuse their social demands with the freedom of the gospel but rather to advance their claims exclusively in the name of human justice. While Pauck is probably correct in suggesting that Luther's harsh reaction to the peasants' demands was due primarily to what he considered a "mixing" of the "two kingdoms," it must nevertheless be recognized that Luther thereby denied a relationship between the freedom of the gospel and human justice. One might expect that Luther today would denounce the work of the late Martin Luther King, Jr., just as he did the demands and the action of the peasants in his own day.

[2] H. Richard Niebuhr states: "This is the basis of Luther's dualism. Christ deals with the fundamental problems of the moral life; he cleanses the springs of action; he creates and recreates the ultimate community in which all action takes place. But by the same token he does not directly govern the external actions or construct the immediate community in which man carries on his work. On the contrary, he sets men free from the inner necessity of finding special vocations and founding special communities in which to attempt to acquire self-respect, and human and divine approval. He releases them from monasteries and the conventicles of the pious for service of their actual neighbors in the world through all the ordinary vocations of men. . . . We may say, then, that the dualism in Luther's

Luther's defenders insist that he is misunderstood at this point. They claim that, according to Luther, the "two kingdoms" really expresses a two-edged ethic. All men are responsible to God for justice as well as for order, cooperating on the basis of human reason. For the Christian, the possibilities of service are shown by and through reason. Learning what is possible in the way of action from an appraisal of the situation, the Christian will work with others for the accomplishment of peace, justice, and freedom as directed and motivated by his faith. Or as one Lutheran writer has stated: "Luther recognized the impossibility of applying the Gospel directly to the difficulty phases of civil life. But he also knew that . . . it does inculcate brotherly love and a sense of responsibility before God, which spell out moral forces making for correct political and civic attitudes and conduct.[1] In other words, the Christian, motivated by love, will know what to do in each concrete situation. Luther believed "in the immediacy of God to each station in life, to every vocation."[2]

---

solution of the Christ-and-culture problem was the dualism of the "How" and the "What" of conduct. From Christ we receive the knowledge and the freedom to do faithfully and lovingly what culture teaches or requires us to do." Christ and Culture (New York: Harper Torchbook, 1951), pp. 174-75.

[1] Heinrich Bornkamm, The Christian Ethos (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1967), p. 273.

[2] Ibid., p. 255.

But restating the "two kingdoms" as a "two-edged ethic" does not really solve the problem. On the contrary, it may point to the very heart of the difficulty. Lutheranism fails to indicate "the relationship between the religious response to the Gospel, a response of humble gratitude, to the self-righteous conflicts of politics" and "the relationship between the ethic of love on the one hand and the moral sentiments of the Christian citizen who seeks to influence secular law and policy to make them more humane as well as more just."[1] Luther's critics are saying that a model of "immediacy" is politically inadequate, that love must be translated into justice through rational criteria in order to be relevant, that the absence of rational criteria allows for subjective and arbitrary action. At least one Lutheran writer has stated that "there is no social ethic which does not include within itself the question as to the forms it is to take. No social ethic can be merely an 'ethic of personal disposition' . . . ."[2]

Contemporary Lutheran scholars, like Luther himself, realize that love cannot be applied directly to public policy. Love provides the Christian's motive for concern with public policy, but it does not provide a policy itself:

> The Christian is impelled by love to be concerned with public policy. His faith contributes certain broad perspectives, and it does rule out extreme alternatives --for example, those of anarchism or totalitarianism.

---

[1] Comments by John C. Bennett on Lazareth, "The Twentieth Century Recovery of Lutheran Political Responsibility," op. cit., p. 141.

[2] Trillhaas, op. cit., p. 49.

> Within these boundaries, the Christian stands on the same footing with those who share his passion for the public welfare, participating in the great debate on social philosophies and political programs, The Christian should be able to bring to discussion of policy questions considerable wisdom about man; but he has no detailed answers packaged in advance.[1]

Justice is "the great middle term into which love is translated when active in the social order."[2] Gustaf Aulen, the Swedish theologian and bishop, asserted that the criterion of judgment to be applied to any specific social program is whether it allows men to act freely out of a "genuine concern for one's neighbor."[3] While these efforts reveal some movement to articulate criteria for action, albeit still rather abstract, most Lutherans continue to focus upon the theological basis for action, its motivation and purpose, rather than explicating the forms and character of action within specific areas of life.[4] Helmut Thielicke, a contemporary German theologian, in fact, has insisted that it is improper for Lutheran theological ethics to establish a hierarchy of ethical values; rather it can only point out the tension with respect to concrete tasks which require action.[1] Thus the problem of a viable Lutheran political ethic remains very much a problem.

---

[1] Franklin Sherman, "Christian Love and Public Policy Today," The Lutheran Quarterly, XIII (August, 1961), 236.

[2] Ibid., p. 234.

[3] This Is the Church (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1952), p. 305.

[4] Cf. Thielicke, Vol. I-II, op. cit.; Joseph Sitler, "The Structure of Christian Ethics" in Letts, Life in Community, op. cit., pp. 3-39; William H. Lazareth, "Christian Faith and Culture" in Letts, Life in Community, op. cit., pp. 40-75; T. A. Kantonen, "Christian Faith and the Political Order" in Letts, Life in Community, op. cit., pp. 113-47; and Edgar Carlson, The Church and the Public Conscience, op. cit.

A third major problem for Lutherans today relates to the relatively negative role defined for the orders of life. Luther believed that the subdivisions of life, e.g., family, economic system, occupations, etc., were constituted by God to control man's sinful impulses. This view, of course, places a low estimate on the role of government; it emphasizes its negative aspect. Thielicke traces this attitude to Luther's view that the state originated as a result of man's sin and not in the creation, as was the view of Calvin.[2] George Forell, an American interpreter of Luther, attributes this negative view of the orders to Luther's belief in the imminent return of Christ.[3] Luther probably shared the common belief that man was living in the last period of history, making social change seem futile.[4] On the other hand, Luther may simply have been pessimistic about the relative value of social reform in general.[5] In any case, this pessimism was conveyed to his contemporaries.

Today, however, government is understood to have a number of positive functions, including the promotion of welfare and social justice and the expansion of freedom and opportunity. The institutions in society are seen dynamically rather than statically and thus can be reshaped according to human need. Contemporary Lutheran scholars are reviewing the concept of civic righteousness as a justification for social and political involvement. One Swedish Lutheran, seeking to correct the traditional Lutheran de-emphasis on the value of civic participation, insists that both Christian righteousness and civic righteousness stem from God and are therefore good.[1] Such a view gives a more positive value to social action.[2] It must be admitted, however, that until recently Lutheranism has not given a very positive cast to social action. But the debate still continues as to the purpose of the political order. Aulen pointed to the state's function in promoting justice and human welfare[3] while others, like Bonhoeffer, trace the purpose of the state to its guarantee of order so that the church can conduct its work.[4]

---

[1] Vol. I, op. cit., pp. 44, 47.

[2] Vol. II, op. cit., p. 571ff.

[3] Op. cit., p. 156.

[4] John Headley, Luther's View of Church History (New York: Yale University Press, 1963), p. 224f.

[5] Klann, op. cit., p. 325.

One of the risks in Protestantism is that "[i]t may talk of a love so pure and a forgiveness so complete that the ethic, while enhancing personal relations, has nothing to say about political life."[1] The present examination of government and political responsibility in the Lutheran tradition seems to suggest that such has indeed been the case in Lutheranism. Luther's concern for the reformation of the church led him to seek political support for its accomplishment, a development which had the subsequent effect of placing the German Lutheran church under the control of the civil authorities. While he exhorted the rulers to rule justly, his failure to allow any effective political opposition against unjust rule served to align the church with conservative political and social forces. In the face of modern totalitarianism the German church was relatively impotent.

---

[1] Törnvall, Andligt och världsligt regemente hos Luther, pp. 169-72. Cited in Sanders, op. cit., pp. 64-65. Cf. Aulen, Church, Law, and Society (New York: Scribners, 1948), p. 109.

[2] Carlson, The Reinterpretation of Luther, op. cit., p. 103; cf. his The Church and the Public Conscience, op. cit., p. 109.

[3] Kan nagot kristet krav ställas pa statslivet? Cited in Carlson, The Reinterpretation of Luther, op. cit., p. 109.

[4] Ethics, translated by Neville Horton Smith and edited by Eberhard Bethge (New York: Macmillan, 1955), p. 306.

Luther quite properly recognized the impossibility of any direct application of love to the political order. He recognized the importance of reason as a guide for public life. But Luther's primary emphasis upon love as a motivation for action led many Lutherans to restrict the application of the love norm to personal action, leaving political activity to operate on the basis of its own internal requirements. Thus, when combined with a basically negative view of the state, Lutheran political ethics ill equipped its adherents for political life.

Today Lutheran scholars are reassessing Lutheran political thought in the light of contemporary needs. They have recognized the aberrations of Lutheran historical development and have begun to clarify the positive role of the state and the limitations of its power as well as the Christian's responsibility for civic righteousness. There is still considerable debate among Lutheran scholars, however, as to whether Lutheran theological ethics can develop a genuine social ethic. The extent to which social and political consciousness has evolved in American Lutheranism is examined in the next chapter.

---

[1] Roger Shinn, "Response of Protestant Ethics to Political Challenges" in Lasswell and Cleveland, op. cit., p. 145.

Chapter IV

SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN AMERICAN LUTHERANISM PRIOR TO 1960, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE PREDECESSORS OF THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH

Lutherans were integrated into the mainstream of American life and society later than most other religious groups. While some Lutherans arrived early in the colonies, the great surge of Lutherans to the United States came with the arrival of German and Scandinavian immigrants in the nineteenth century. In the century after 1820 more than five million Germans and two million Scandinavian Lutherans made the transition to a new life, most of them to the midwestern and western parts of this country.[1] Unlike the small number of already-settled Lutherans on the eastern seaboard, the new arrivals were isolated due to heritage, language, and rural location. Not until the Second World War did American Lutherans assume any significant responsibility for the social order.

This chapter portrays the development of social consciousness among American Lutherans, giving special attention to the four Lutheran groups which constituted the new American

---

[1] Conrad Bergendoff, The Church of the Lutheran Reformation (St. Louis: Concordia, 1967), p. 240.

Lutheran Church in 1960. The four churches singled out for such consideration are the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Free Church, and the former American Lutheran Church.[1]

"Quietism" in American Lutheranism

Walter Rauschenbusch said of Lutheran social consciousness at the beginning of the twentieth century:

> Some denominations have not yet awakened. For instance, the Lutherans have beautiful institutional charities, but it is hard to discern any trace that as a body they are sharing in the new social enthusiasm. . . . They have never exercised the influence in public life to which their numbers, the splendid qualities of their Teutonic stock, and the ability of their leaders would have entitled them.[2]

H. Richard Niebuhr, former professor of Christian ethics at Yale Divinity School, observed that Lutherans tended "to give up the area of 'natural things' as beyond the scope of the

---

[1] Studies particularly helpful in this chapter included: Svendsbye, op. cit.; Abdel Ross Wentz, A Basic History of Lutheranism in America, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964); E. Clifford Nelson and E. L. Fevold, The Lutheran Church Among Norwegian-Americans, Vols. I-II (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1960); Fred Meuser, The Formation of the American Lutheran Church (Columbus: Wartburg, 1958); Frederick Wentz, Lutherans in Concert (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1968); Haas, op. cit.; Robert L. Anderson, op. cit. The Svendsbye study constitutes a most thorough comparison and analysis of the emerging social consciousness in the four churches mentioned in his title. Primary sources examined herein included the convention reports of the Lutheran Free Church and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church from 1930 to 1962 and 1930 to 1960 respectively, and of the former American Lutheran Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church from 1945 to 1960.

[2] Christianizing the Social Order (New York: Macmillan, 1912), p. 128f.

Word. . . ."[1]

Lutheran historians have agreed with these observations. Abdel Ross Wentz, the historian of American Lutheranism, has written concerning Lutheranism at the beginning of the century:

> . . . the general position of Lutherans at this time was that the work of the church is to regenerate human souls one by one, and that social reform must begin with individuals, not groups. The program to save men by changing their environment was held to be nothing more than golden-rule ethics which forfeits the spiritual worth of the individual. Lutherans were taught to recognize the need for social improvement, and they were encouraged to co-operate with organizations outside the church in improving social conditions, but the main emphasis of the church continued to be placed on man's sin in his relation to God, the need for regeneration of the individual soul, the relief of physical distress, the activities of the inner missions, and the institutions of mercy.[2]

Wentz further notes that "[n]ot until well into the twentieth century did Lutheranism have anything to say about the industrial and economic situation that produced the major social problems of the time."[3] He concludes simply that to American Lutherans, "[s]in and evil referred to theology, and there was no social ethic."[4] Fred Meuser, the historian of the former American Lutheran Church, claims that Lutherans "were not ready to accept the Calvinistic concept of the church's responsibility to shape the life of society as a whole."[1] E. Clifford Nelson, historian of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, said the same with respect to Norwegian-American Lutheranism:

---

[1] The Kingdom of God in America (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1937, 1959), p. 40.

[2] Op. cit., p. 321.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

> [T]here was . . . no real appreciation of the Lutheran social ethic. The 'social gospel' from which they turned . . . was not yet seen as one of the ways by which the church was being awakened to Christian social action. This was to come, but two world wars would lie between. Meanwhile, Christian welfare was directed solely to rescuing individuals, the lost, the homeless, the straying--the least of Christ's brethren.[2]

Lutherans generally were not influenced by the Social Gospel movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[3] For both sociological and theological reasons Lutherans remained fairly aloof from the Social Gospel. The rural and linguistic isolation of many Lutherans, the small number of Lutheran immigrants who actually joined churches, and the spirit of individualism and self-reliance of the Lutherans--all contributed to their lack of serious engagement with the Social Gospel.[4] Theologically, the strong Lutheran emphasis on sin, belief in the transcendence of God and his Kingdom, and the need for individual regeneration, mitigated against efforts at social reform. In addition, the sharp separation between the shperes of church and state prevented Lutherans either from functioning as the conscience of the community or from bearing public witness on major social problems. Lloyd Svendsbye, who analyzed the social consciousness of four large American Lutheran groups from 1930 to 1960, states that

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

[2] Vol. II, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

[3] The General Synod was the most Americanized Lutheran church in the United States in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and therefore the one most receptive to the influence of the Social Gospel. Cf. Lentz, *op. cit.*

[4] Abdel Ross Wentz estimates that less than 30% of the Norwegian immigrants, 20% of the Swedes, and 7% of the Danes joined an American church. *Op. cit.*, p. 179. In 1910 more than three-fourths of American Lutherans lived in rural communities or towns of fewer than 2,500 residents. Pp. 47, 191. In a 1954 study based on 1951 statistics, the church bodies had the following percentage of members in communities of 2,500 or above: United Lutheran Church in America--72%, the Augustana Lutheran Church--70%, the American Lutheran Church

> American Lutherans . . . held to twin principles which prevented an effective assault on the public conscience. First, their emphasis on the divine ordinance of the office or magistrate tended to underwrite the status quo and to emphasize obedience and order. Second, their sharp theological separation of the functions of church and state tended to thwart any effective witness on the part of the church either to the state or to the individual Christian.[1]

Lutherans concentrated upon individual conversion and charity. Rather than challenging the basic structures of

---

--58%, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church--41%. "A Profile of the Lutheran Church in the United States," mimeographed report prepared by the National Lutheran Council's Division of American Missions, Chicago, 1954, p. 15a, cited in Svendsbye, op. cit., footnote on p. 207.

Concerning the use of language, the Ohio Synod (one of the constituting groups in the formation of the former American Lutheran Church in 1930) continued to use German as its primary language until 1930. Svendsbye, op. cit., p. 11. The immigrant's spirit of individualism and self-reliance placed most Lutherans in the Republican Party. Abdel Ross Wentz, op. cit., p. 165. Svendsbye notes that the slavery issue, the money policies of the GOP, and the German sense of individual responsibility tended to make Lutherans conservative politically and economically, thus hindering the development of a corporate responsibility for social action. Op. cit., p. 14.

[1] Op. cit., p. 23.

society and working to change them, Lutherans tended to focus on alleviating the suffering of particular individuals. Most social responsibility was directed at homes for orphans and the aged, hospitals and deaconess houses, work with seamen and immigrants, and missions among prisoners and in blighted urban areas. For the most part, they "expressed their social concern in terms of charity toward the needy. They did not yet regard their responsibility as extending to broader areas of social concern. Thus, if by nothing but silent acceptance, they tended to underwrite the economic, social and political status quo."[1] Indeed, "Lutheranism as a whole . . . persisted in its historic reluctance to engage upon affairs of the state and the world and until late in the 'thirties gave no leaders to the cause."[2]

The phase of broadening social concern, mentioned in Chapter I, did not come to the Lutheran churches until World War II. While some social consciousness was manifest before the Second World War, the Depression seems to have had little noticeable influence on the development. The emergence of the Second World War, the tyranny of Nazism in the homeland of Luther, the new world responsibilities of the United States, the post-war threat of Communism, the increasing urbanization of American life, and the continuing Americanization of Lutherans, however, created a new situation. These changes, along with

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 53.

2. Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

increasing ecumenical ties and the neo-orthodox theological emphasis upon God's transcendence, man's sin, and personal moral responsibility which served to deepen the moral idealism of the Social Gospel movement, made Lutherans more receptive to cooperation with other Protestant groups and more concerned about their own social responsibility.

Social Awakening Through Inter-Lutheran Cooperation

Inter-Lutheran cooperation had received new impetus as a result of joint efforts in World War I.[1] The National Lutheran Council[2] which included all Lutheran churches except the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod and a few small conservative groups had been organized in 1918. Numerically the NLC embraced two-thirds of American Lutherans. In 1933, it established a Committee on Social Trends to advise it on social trends and issues. The work of this committee led to the NLC's adoption of statements on the liquor industry, motion pictures, social security, opposition to the causes of war, and endorsement of American neutrality in 1940. The following year, the committee's work was combined with the social welfare activity of the Council, a step which reduced the attention given to general public problems. In fact, "[f]rom the end of World War II until about 1957 the Council seldom sought the role of Lutheran spokesman on public issues, except through the Washington office and personal contact."[1]

---

[1] The story of inter-Lutheran cooperation is told in Frederick Wentz, especially pp. 86-88 and p. 180ff.

[2] The National Lutheran Council will hereafter be referred to by the letters, NLC.

The establishment of the Washington office was indeed a new development for Lutherans. The office was created in 1948 under the NLC's Division of Public Relations in order to maintain contact with executive agencies of the federal government, to keep the NLC informed concerning pending legislation, to represent the NLC before congressional committees, and to keep the government informed concerning programs of the member churches. Robert Van Deusen, who later received his Ph.D in political science, has served as director of the office since its beginning.

In the early 1950's, the NLC in officially-adopted statements commended the United States government and the United Nations for their efforts to prevent genocide, supported the United Nations in its efforts on behalf of human rights and the plight of refugees, and supported the Point Four program. Finally, in 1953, the NLC authorized the Committee on Social Trends, operating at that time under the Division of Social Welfare, to prepare statements on national and international issues and trends for study by the member churches. Subsequently, the NLC took positions opposing the publication of the names of welfare recipients, requested revision of immigration laws, opposed the naming of an ambassador to the Vatican and federal aid to elementary and secondary parochial schools, deplored acts of anti-Semitism, and condemned segregation. In 1961 (after the election!) it adopted a statement which rejected the claim that religious faith in itself should arbitrarily eliminate the favorable consideration of a political candidate. It should be noted, however, that the NLC's Social Trends Committee had submitted the proposed statement to the Council prior to the election. When the NLC was replaced by the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. in 1967, the Committee on Social Trends was abolished.

---

[1] Abdel Ross Wentz, op. cit., p. 181.

These efforts of the National Lutheran Council represented an increasing Lutheran awareness of social responsibility. The Council increasingly spoke out on a wide range of social issues and utilized the Washington office to represent the interests of Lutherans in the nation's capital. Active efforts were made to influence policy, especially in the areas of civil rights and immigration legislation. While such efforts were undertaken cautiously, they nevertheless indicated an unmistakeable willingness to assume broadened responsibility for the direction of national life.

The activity of one other inter-Lutheran group, the American Lutheran Conference, also needs to be mentioned in passing. The Conference was composed of many of the same member churches which formed the National Lutheran Council. The Commission on Social Relations of the Conference provided statements on movies, race relations, anti-Semitism, citizenship, economic life, and birth control, prior to the end of the Conference in 1954. While the work of the Commission on Social Relations of the Conference and the Committee on Social Trends of the National Lutheran Council was not binding on the member churches, it served to stimulate the social thinking of the churches' leadership and members.

The United Lutheran Church in America and the Augustana Lutheran Church

Among the Lutheran churches in the United States, the United Lutheran Church in America and the Augustana Lutheran Church reflected the most advanced development in social consciousness.

During the 1930's the United Lutheran Church, the largest, most urbanized, industrialized and ecumenical of the Lutheran churches, exhibited the same general concern for personal regeneration, patient tolerance of the status quo, and expression of charity as her sister Lutheran bodies. Although a Committee on Moral and Social Welfare had been established in 1918, the influence of the staffless committee was negligible. While social action was seen as a dimension of the church's responsibility and reflected in the combining of the committee with the Committee on Evangelism and the Board of Inner Missions into a new Board of Social Missions in 1939, it was not until 1947 that a full-time staff person for social action was engaged. The first social action director, Harold

Letts, had been greatly influenced by Reinhold Niebuhr.[1] Letts' work included research to inform the church on social issues and methods of social action, efforts to shape public opinion and secure social legislation, and general awakening of social consciousness in the United Lutheran Church.

During and following World War II, leadership in the developing social consciousness came from the Board of Social Missions and its staff, key theological professors, the church's journals, and from the ecumenical engagements of the church. In addition to Letts, important intellectual and administrative leadership was given by G. Elson Ruff, editor of the official publication of the church, The Lutheran; Harold Haas, successor to Letts; Rufus Cornelson, social action staff; Jerald Brauer, Joseph Sittler, William Lazareth, T. A. Kantonen, and George Forell, all theological professors; and O. Frederick Nolde, until recently director of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches. Considerable attention was given to issues of war and peace, race relations, sex and marriage, labor relations, capital punishment, and other problems.[2] In addition the United Lutheran Church sponsored numerous institutes on social issues and vocationally-oriented conferences. The publication of the three volume series,

---

[1] The direction of Niebuhr's influence was indicated in Chapter 2, p. 19ff.

[2] The social statements of the United Lutheran Church in America appear in Social Statements of the United Lutheran Church in America, 1918-1962 (New York: Board of Social Missions, c. 1962).

Christian Social Responsibility, in 1957 contributed to serious discussion and development of the relationship of theology and current social issues.[1] Indeed, the United Lutheran Church stood on the frontier of Lutheran social responsibility in the post-war period.

The development of social responsibility in the Augustana Lutheran Church was slower than in the United Lutheran Church. In 1936, it established a Commission on Morals and Social Problems which gave attention to the use of alcohol, labor problems, war and peace, race relations, marriage and sex, and other concerns of the period. Although the commission never had a salaried staff, A. D. Mattson, professor of Christian ethics at Augustana Lutheran Theological Seminary, gave invaluable leadership as chairman of the commission. Other leadership was given by E. E. Ryden, editor of The Lutheran Companion, the official publication; Edgar Carlson, then president of Gustavus Adolphus College; Conrad Bergandorf, then president and professor at Augustana Lutheran Seminary; and others. Both the Augustana Lutheran Church and the United Lutheran Church joined the National Council of Churches as charter members in 1950 and the World Council of Churches at its beginning in 1948.

The United Lutheran Church and the Augustana Lutheran Church both were more advanced in the assumption of responsibility for the social order than the Lutheran churches forming the new American Lutheran Church in 1960.[1] Both the United Lutheran Church and the Augustana Lutheran Church led the other Lutheran bodies in developing a social ethic as a guide to social involvement. In the United Lutheran Church, the quest for a new social ethic was the result of formal direction from the church's convention, resulting in the Christian Social Responsibility series, while in the Augustana Lutheran Church such leadership came from individuals acting independently on their own initiative. Both churches had agencies for the purpose of considering social problems, the United Lutheran Church since 1918 and the Augustana Lutheran Church since 1936, but only the former had salaried staff for its agency prior to 1962.

---

[1] The three volumes were edited by Harold Letts under the titles: Existence Today, The Lutheran Heritage, and Life in Community.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church[2]

In comparison with the United Lutheran Church in America, the Augustana Lutheran Church, and the former American Lutheran Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church reflected the least change in social responsibility prior to 1960. In fact, "[t]he minutes of that body, as well as reports from the districts, are almost exclusively devoid of any references whatsoever to social issues, with the exception of a fairly strong concern for the support of welfare and charitable institutions, and an endorsement of temperance, both of which had been typical of certain sections of Lutheranism."[1] The church pledged its "moral support" to the prohibition law and in biennial conventions regularly adopted resolutions warning against the evils of alcohol and urging support for the Anti-Saloon League. But it did little more. Although the Norwegian-American religious body was predominantly rural, the church's leaders seemed "insulated against real poverty and famine, [and] attempted to speak with authority about contentment and the unfailing promise of a sovereign God to people who had had to live for years on the edge of starvation."[2] Officially the church was reluctant to go "[b]eyond sympathy, a lively interest, and an innocuous denunciation of undefined evil . . . ."[3]

---

[1] Svendsbye, op. cit., p. 346ff.

[2] Prior to 1946 the Evangelical Lutheran Church was named the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America. At its formation in 1918 it contained 92% of the Norwegians in America. Bergendoff, op. cit., p. 256.

Even after the Second World War there were few formal actions on social issues. The use of alcohol was still biennially condemned. The appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican was objected to in 1946 and again in 1952.[4] In 1952 and 1954 the church called upon the Congress to allow the voluntary participation of clergymen in social security.[5] In 1960 the convention adopted a resolution commending the government for making surplus commodities available to the churches for distribution abroad and recommending that such aid be channeled through the United Nations.[1] A similar resolution had been rejected four years earlier.[2] On the issue of war and peace, the 1950 convention called for increased use of prayer as a response to the threat of war.[3] On the above items, it should be observed that concern for social security for ministers, the Vatican ambassador, and surplus commodities all affected institutional interests of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

---

[1] Svendsbye, _op. cit._, p. 66.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 68.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 70.

[4] _Annual Report of the Evangelical Lutheran Church_ (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1946), p. 377; _Annual Report_ (1954), pp. 36, 477.

[5] _Annual Report_ (1952), pp. 497-99; _Annual Report_ (1954), p. 465.

The first noticeable shift in social responsibility occurred in 1952 when the convention again affirmed the church's traditional concern for changing men's hearts, but went on to state that "we believe also that as Christians it is our social responsibility to endeavor to unify, direct and support such principles of Government and society as are necessary to the establishment of a social order which is conducive to the daily living of a Christ-centered life."[4] It also contended that "the Church must speak out forcibly against such forces as are morally destructive to human life," including active citizenship, voting, and correspondence to the press and political leaders.

Fredrik A. Schiotz, the present president of the

---

1. Annual Report (1960), p. 453.
2. Annual Report (1956), pp. 506, 521.
3. Annual Report (1950), p. 513.
4. Annual Report (1952), pp. 35-36, 477.

American Lutheran Church, was elected president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1954. In his address to the convention in 1956 he sharply criticized the efforts of segregationists and hailed the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in the public schools.[1] He also called attention to discrimination by churches against Indian Americans. He drew attention to world hunger, colonialism, and on the question of Communism noted Marx's "compassion for the masses" as well as "the satanic aberrations of international Communism." But the convention's call for racial concord and an end to colonialism appear to have stemmed more from concern for the impact on world missions than from the inherent justice of the positions.[2] In 1958 the convention adopted the National Lutheran Council statement, "A Christian Affirmation on Human Relations," which condemned segregation.[3]

A growing concern for social justice also was reflected in The Lutheran Herald. O. G. Malmin, the editor, strongly condemned segregation and treated a number of other subjects, including the question of recognition of the Chinese Peoples' Republic, labor relations, released time, foreign aid, and peace time military training. He also supported the call of Norway's Bishop Berggrav to overcome the traditional Lutheran dichotomy between church and state.[1]

---

[1] Annual Report (1956), pp. 14-16.

[2] Svendsbye, op. cit., pp. 221-22.

[3] Annual Report (1958), p. 473.

The slow rate of change in the social consciousness of the Evangelical Lutheran Church was due to a number of factors.[2] Sociologically, the church remained predominantly a rural church and did not sharply confront the kind of tensions present in the urban areas. Theologically, questions of biblical criticism and confessional authority rather than social ethics were dominant. Furthermore, the church had no recognized leader in the area of social ethics. Ecclesiastically, merger negotiations preoccupied the attention of the church's leaders. About all that can be said regarding the social concern of the Evangelical Lutheran Church is that

> There were individuals who had caught a vision of this new concern and had made some kind of personal embodiment of it. Much teaching would be required to produce significant change. Little discernible assistance had come from Luther Seminary in St. Paul. Some of this teaching would have to come from the partners to the new merger. Dr. Carl F. Reuss stood in the wings ready to provide pedagogical leadership.[3]

The United Evangelical Lutheran Church[4] and the Lutheran Free Church

The characterization of social consciousness in the

---

[1] Svendsbye, *op. cit.*, p. 224ff.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 128f.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 237.

[4] Until 1944 the United Evangelical Lutheran Church was the United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

United Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Free Church is very similar to that of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. In both of them the primary social concern related to social welfare activities, such as children's homes, homes for the aged, and regular exhortations on temperance.

The United Evangelical Lutheran Church was very conscious of the effects of the Depression and the problems of war. Both were attributed to individual greed; calamities were viewed as God's chastisement. There appears to have been no awareness of the social origin of institutional causes of inequality. The comment of President N. C. Carlsen at the 1932 convention is typical:

> It is a peculiar day in which we live. Financial depression, crime waves following one another in rapid succession. A collapse of morals and of much of that which is *called* Christian life. Why are conditions as we find them today? In answering that question, let us be honest with our God, ourselves and our fellowmen. Much of the blame must be laid to the church. The human heart with its selfishness and greed, is, no doubt, at the root of that economic upheaval, under which we suffer.[1]

In 1940, commenting on the war and world conditions, he said "We naturally ask--how shall we account for the deplorable world conditions of today? The answer is simply this--man has become sufficient unto himself."[2] Again in 1942 Carlsen said: "But if our cause is just, why should this cruel war come upon the nation? Surely God could have spared us. Yet, but we needed chastening. God uses war as a chastening rod on the nation because we have sinned against Him."[1]

---

[1] *Yearbook of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church Church* (Blair, Neb.: Lutheran Publishing House, 1932), p. 1.

[2] *Yearbook* (1940), p. 3.

On specific issues, the 1940 convention refused to adopt a resolution on conscientious objection as requested by the Lutheran Student Association.[2] Resolutions were adopted in both 1937 and 1952 urging that ministers be made eligible for social security.[3] The 1942 and 1943 conventions pledged loyalty to the American war cause.[4] Other actions included opposition to an ambassador to the Vatican,[5] opposition to a chaplain rather than the services of the army chaplaincy at the Air Force Academy,[6] adoption of the National Lutheran Council statement, "A Christian Affirmation on Human Relations,"[7] and adoption of a resolution commending the National Lutheran Council statement, "Toward a Statement on National Policy," to the congregations for study.[8]

In the Lutheran Free Church, T. O. Burntvedt, who served as president from 1931 until 1959, included a perceptive analysis

---

[1] *Yearbook* (1942), p. 3.

[2] *Yearbook* (1940), p. 175.

[3] *Yearbook* (1937), p. 150; *Yearbook* (1952), p. 212.

[4] *Yearbook* (1942), p. 177; *Yearbook* (1943), p. 167.

[5] *Yearbook* (1946), p. 186.

[6] *Yearbook* (1955), p. 182.

[7] *Yearbook* (1958), p. 224.

[8] *Yearbook* (1959), pp. 26-28, 216.

XUM

of social needs in his addresses to the annual conferences of the church. In the early years, however, he attributed the cause of social problems to sin. His address to the 1936 annual conference is illustrative. In the address he recognized the importance and value of economic reform and changes in the social order, but claimed they "constitute[d] no permanent remedy for the moral and social ills of our generation."[1] Instead, "[t]he Church needs to have the central truths of her message revitalized in order that she may proclaim to a self-sufficient generation with positiveness and authority that the ultimate cause of all personal and social misery and evil is sin, and the only permanent remedy is to turn from sin to Jesus Christ. . . ." Not until 1945 did any of Burntvedt's messages recognize the danger of quietism. Then he observed that "[t]oo often churches with strong emphases upon genuine piety and living Christianity have shown little interest in questions vital to the political, economic and social welfare of our own nation and the nations of the world."[2] He emphasized that "Jesus was not only interested in the soul of man. . . . He came into the world of a single purpose and the Gospel He gave us to proclaim to the world is one, individually accepted in faith and socially applied in action." As a result of this stand, the annual conference urged church members to take an active part in contributing to the solution of political, economic, and social problems.[1]

---

[1] Annual Report of the Lutheran Free Church ([Minneapolis: Messenger Press], 1936), pp. 6-7.

[2] Annual Report (1945), pp. 6-7.

In 1961, John Stensvaag, Burntvedt's successor, pointed to the dangers of Communism and McCarthyism and noted problem of church-state relations, federal aid to parochial schools, racial prejudice, and alcoholism.[2] He lamented the fact that church members frequently had attitudes of racial prejudice like the rest of the public and called for more than the passing of resolutions. His call for repentance, however, seems as socially and politically irrelevant as the resolutions whose effectiveness he questioned.

Besides the annual resolution supporting temperance, few specific social issues were considered. In 1940 and 1952 the nomination of an ambassador to the Vatican was opposed.[3] The latter conference also opposed Universal Military Training.[4] It adopted the National Lutheran Council statement, "A Christian Affirmation on Human Relations," in 1958.[5] In 1960 anti-Semitism was deplored and, recognizing the issue of religion in the national political campaign, it urged "every voter to make a complete appraisal of a candidate's views in this area also."[6]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 22, 100.

[2] Annual Report (1961), pp. 7-9.

[3] Annual Report (1940), pp. 25, 142; Annual Report (1952), p. 9.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Annual Report (1958), pp. 171, 185.

[6] Annual Report (1960), p. 170.

The following year federal and state aid to elementary and secondary parochial schools was opposed and "peaceful measures" leading to social equality were supported.[1] Except for the resolutions on race relations, which caused no problem for the Lutheran Free Church, the other resolutions related to the institutional interests of the church.

One slight advance came in 1946 when a Committee on Christian Social Relations was appointed.[2] It was made permanent in 1949.[3] While the new board was intended "to study current social problems and trends" as one of its assignments, most of its time was devoted to the concerns of social welfare agencies. As the time approached for the Lutheran Free Church to take its final vote on the possibility of merger with the new American Lutheran Church, the Board of Social Relations distributed to the pastors a number of social statements prepared by the former American Lutheran Church.[4] The last annual conference in 1962 also called for the establishment of a Social Relations Committee in each congregation for the purpose of focusing on community social problems.[5]

Thus, social responsibility developed very slowly in both the United Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Lutheran

---

[1] Annual Report (1961), pp. 148-49, 162; pp. 150, 162.

[2] Annual Report (1946), p. 115.

[3] Annual Report (1949), pp. 146-47.

[4] Annual Report (1961), pp. 90-91.

[5] Annual Report (1962), pp. 172, 182-83.

Free Church from 1930 to 1960.[1] In the 1930's, social, economic, and political problems were seen as the result of human sin and as a punishment or testing from God. Their solution anticipated the conversion of individuals to Christian faith. Beginning during World War II there was a very gradual realization that individuals should confront social, economic, and political problems as an outgrowth of Christian faith. Both churches increasingly spoke out on social issues at their national conventions, although most of the issues considered still related to the institutional needs and interests of the bodies. Individuals rather than the corporate church was still the means of involvement. Finally, in the late 1940's, the Lutheran Free Church, unlike the United Evangelical Lutheran Church or the Evangelical Lutheran Church, created a church unit to focus on social problems and even called for similar units in the congregations.

The American Lutheran Church

The former American Lutheran Church underwent a considerably greater shift in its social responsibility than any of its partners in the 1960 merger. In the 1930's, however, the same general toleration of social problems characteristic of other Lutheran churches also prevailed in the American Lutheran

---

[1] The slow rate of the development of social consciousness in the Lutheran Free Church is also reflected in the absence of any mention of social or political action by Eugene Fevold in The Lutheran Free Church (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1969).

Church. For example, the address of the president to the 1932 biennial convention evidenced "a crude doctrine of providence and an uncritical acceptance of the status quo."[1] It was "both compassionless and contradictory in the manner in which it overlooked the real facts of human existence." In general, the prevalent attitude of the period reflected a "kind of providentialism with [an] outright determinism [which] left no room for even a modified human freedom without which any kind of social responsibility, individual or corporate, was impossible."[2] One exception, however, was E. W. Schramm, editor of The Lutheran Standard, the official publication, who frequently focused attention upon the church's responsibility for social problems.

The first real sign of change came at the 1940 convention when the executive committee of the American Lutheran Church was directed to serve as a commission to study current social trends and problems and to offer guidance to the church. The development was "an epoch-making decision,"[3] representing "a significant departure from the past tradition of quietism."[4] In 1946 the Board of Charities was enlarged to include the area of concern for social issues, and in 1948 the Board of Charities became the Board for Christian Social Action. The new duties assigned to the board included "research and study on the

---

1. Svendsbye, op. cit., p. 91.
2. Ibid., p. 95.
3. Ibid., p. 238.
4. Ibid., p. 103.

pressing social problems of the day" and "dissemination of the findings of its research and study through already-existing and yet-to-be-developed channels of communication for the information and education of the members of the American Lutheran Church."[1] Carl F. Reuss, with a Ph.D in sociology, assumed part-time responsibility for the board as executive secretary in 1947, becoming full-time in 1951.

The new change in social responsibility can be seen in the circulation of two pamphlets and in the adoption of a social pronouncement in 1948. Christian Social Living was a compilation of statements on family life, labor, human relations, citizenship, and "social vices" (alcohol and gambling) formulated by the Commission on Social Relations of the American Lutheran Conference from 1938-1948.[2] The Church's Social Ministry was a statement prepared in 1945 by the social action committee of the Ohio district of the church.[3] It was printed and circulated by the Board of Charities in the American Lutheran Church, and thus implicitly endorsed. It was the first systematic articulation of responsibility for the direction of society in the American Lutheran Church. As such, the study indicated a marked shift from the complete separation of church and state and the neglect of social justice which had characterized the previous period.

---

[1] Minutes of the Board of Charities, 1946, pp. 181-82, 188. Because the Board for Christian Social Action also had responsibility for social welfare work in the church, it was not until 1954 that the Board was able to devote the bulk of its time to social action matters. Cf. Minutes of the Board for Christian Social Action, 1954, p. 295.

[2] Christian Social Living (Columbus: Board for Christian Social Action, 1948).

[3] The Church's Social Ministry (Columbus: Board of Charities, 1947). In an interview on July 9, 1969, Carl Reuss stated that this study was very instrumental in the formation of the Board for Christian Social Action. He indicated that the thought in the study was pioneering and ahead of its time in the thinking of the American Lutheran Church.

The Church's Social Ministry acknowledged that "in general, the Lutheran Church has not accepted as it should its responsibility as a prophetic interpreter of history and culture, especially in America." It warned that the doctrine of justification by faith should not cause Lutherans to lose sight of the relative ethical value of human activity. The publication also recognized that "preventive therapy for social ills is, in the long run, more beneficient than remedial therapy: and noted that Lutherans had usually "been more zealous for philanthropy than for social justice. . . ." The study further noted that corporate evil frequently goes unrecognized because it is embodied in established social conditions and custom. It admitted that "the radical modification of the social tradition is generally beyond the capacity of the individual" and affirmed "that what man is free to create, historically speaking, he is also free to modify or abolish." Christians were asked to "accept [their] share of responsibility for the working of social machinery and judge its value in terms of human welfare." In working for change, the statement refused to ban the possibility of revolution, although it urged the use of democratic and constitutional methods. It acknowledged Luther's unconditional condemnation of revolution, but at the same time held that "in allowing that there comes an ultimate point where the Christian must 'obey God rather than man' he left open a possibility that the revolting party may actually be the authentic protagonist of law, order, and public justice, instead of the 'legitimate' party." The Church's Social Ministry also endorsed democracy, rebuked the greed of capitalism, acknowledged the partial responsibility of the church for the rise of Nazism, Fascism, and Communism, labelled war a sin, and called for racial integration of worship life. The American Lutheran Church was indeed moving into the phase of "broadening concern for social issues."

But while The Church's Social Ministry called the church to social responsibility and the reform of society, it still looked to individual regeneration and action as the source of social change. It claimed that "[s]ince all social evil traces back to man's sinful status, it follows that only by the power of the Gospel can the life of man be radically redeemed and social pathology be cured at the center of infection." Thus, Christian social action "must be primarily directed to breaking the power of sin in the individual life, and only secondarily to checking and ameliorating its ravages in social life." As will be shown later with respect to the present American Lutheran Church, the study document recognized the corporate nature of social problems but advanced only individual effort to effect change. Even the definition of "social action" betrayed the individualistic stance. Social action was defined as "the church's testimony regarding the application of Christian principles to the concrete social problems of the day, and its endeavor by education and persuasion to actualize Christian ethical ideals in social life and institutions." Even in the congregation, social action "does not aim to use the congregation as a pressure group to force reform, but aims to induce the individual to use his influence to permeate his community with the Christian attitudes--to enunciate the principles of Christianity for the development of favorable environment." "Social action" essentially was social education.

The policy statement, "Aims and Purposes of the American Lutheran Church in Its Program of Christian Social Action," adopted by the biennial convention in 1948, incorporated this new social awareness into official policy guidelines.[1] It called upon the members of the church to "work for the permeation of the Christian gospel into the whole of daily living" and to engage in efforts "to reshape the social and economic structure where and when it evidences maladjustments, in order first to prevent, so far as possible, those conditions which cause persons to seek outside help in coping with their own affairs; and in order, second, to provide a social environment favorable to the fullest development of individual human capacities." It affirmed that both church and state,

---

[1] The statement is printed along with the other social policy statements of the former American Lutheran Church in The Christian in His Social Living ([Columbus]: Board for Christian Social Action, 1960), pp. 86-90. Svendsbye notes that this statement "constituted a formal repudiation of the quietistic stance which would so separate the spheres of church and state as to deny the church the right to speak to its members about secular concerns." Op. cit., p. 244.

> being divinely appointed institutions serving fundamental needs of mankind, stand in a position of mutual subordination and superordination, each serving areas of primary and areas of secondary responsibility. Thus it reaffirms its conviction that church and state may well cooperate in rendering welfare services so long as the church suffers no infringement of its freedom to teach and to practice its Christian beliefs, and so long as the state is not made an agent of the church to do its bidding or to enforce by its powers the decisions of any church group.

As a result of the statement the district presidents began to reflect the new position, and social action committees were formed at the district and congregational levels.[1]

The Board for Christian Social Action gave leadership to the development of the new social awareness. In 1948 and 1956 it led in the promotion of Christian citizenship as the church-wide emphasis. It also maintained a staff position and supported a program of education and action in church-industrial relations. Carl Reuss, the executive director of the board, provided the American Lutheran Church with statements covering a wider variety of areas than any other Lutheran church group in the United States.[2] While all of the statements were not officially adopted by the conventions of the church, the general procedure was to submit the statements to the pastors or congregations in order to stimulate discussion and response

---

[1] Svendsbye, op. cit., p. 244ff.

[2] Ibid., p. 251.

XUM

prior to convention consideration.[1] Statements were prepared on marriage and divorce, planned parenthood, agriculture, labor relations, governmental fiscal policies, race relations, euthanasia, capital punishment, freedom of discussion and dissent, church-state relations, alcohol and gambling, subversive movements, foreign aid, international affairs, the mass media, censorship, and the public schools. These statements were compiled and printed in 1955 as The Christian in His Social Living, revised and updated in a 1960 edition.[2]

---

[1] The purpose of social statements in the American Lutheran Church can be seen in the statement on "Underlying Philosophy," adopted by the 1968 convention. It held that statements were "statements of guidance" which were to outline "points of view which a Christian should take into account, attitudes he should consider, and lines of action he might pursue. This represents an education approach designed to offer a basis for action." It noted that statements of the Board for Christian Social Action were designed "to stimulate thinking and to promote discussion. . . . In no sense are its statements to be regarded as 'pronouncements,' for they do not purport to represent an official position, an authoritative expression, or a doctrinal formulation of the church." It declared that "[n]either the Board nor the church is a lobbying organization. It is not the task of the church corporately to press for specific pieces of legislation. Its testimony, if given corporately, is limited to moral and ethical principles. Normally its activities with reference to legislation are designed to encourage individual Christians to express to legislators their conscientious Christian views." It also stated that "[t]he Board in issuing any statement reflects only its own thinking or expresses views for which it alone accepts responsibility. Only the church in convention has the right and authority to speak in the name of the church." At the same time "[t]he individual member, pastor, or congregation remains free to accept, modify, or to reject the views expressed by the Board. How the materials are used remains an individual decision." Minutes of the Board for Christian Social Action, 1958, pp. 361-33.

[2] The Christian in His Social Living ([Columbus]: Board for Christian Social Action). Subsequent references to this booklet are to the 1960 edition hereafter referred to as Social Living.

At the beginning of the Korean war, the board called upon Christians to confess their share of responsibility for the conflict and warned American citizens not to regard the war as a holy crusade.[1] The 1954 convention recommended for study a statement which emphasized the biblical injunctions relating to peace and cautioned against the hope of security in national resources.[2] In the late 1950's, the board also revised and circulated position statements on national policy and foreign aid prepared by the Committee on Social Trends of the National Lutheran Council.[3] At the height of the McCarthy era, the board warned that unpopular views must be heard respectfully without being labelled subversive or un-American.[4]

The American Lutheran Church placed the responsibility for education with parents who could choose either public or private schools for their children. But all citizens had an obligation to provide tax support for public schools, and funds raised through taxation were to be used only in support of publicly controlled education. The church also expressed caution on the use of released time, but endorsed the teaching "about" religion in the public schools as distinguished from the teaching "of" religion, leaving the question of religious exercises in the schools to local option.[1]

---

[1] "The International Crisis" in Social Living, pp. 80-81.

[2] "Peace and Security" in Official Report of the American Lutheran Church (1954), pp. 322-23.

[3] "Toward a Statement on National Policy" and "Position Paper on Foreign Aid," revised in Social Living, op. cit., pp. 81-84.

[4] "Freedom for Discussion" in Social Living, op. cit., pp. 55-57.

On other matters, the American Lutheran Church opposed the naming of an American ambassador to the Vatican,[2] called upon the congregations to condemn segregation,[3] adopted the National Lutheran Council statement, "A Christian Affirmation on Human Relations,"[4] and allowed freedom in the moderate use of alcoholic beverages.[5] Prior to the 1960 national election, the church recognized that a candidate's religious faith could be one of the legitimate factors in a voter's decision, but warned against arbitrarily opposing a candidate because of his religious views and without evaluating his other qualifications.[6] The Board for Christian Social Action circulated statements which endorsed planned parenthood and allowed for the remarriage of divorced persons."[7] In his analysis of the social consciousness in

---

[1] "The Christian and His Public Schools" in Social Living, op. cit., pp. 78-80.

[2] Official Report (1950), p. 395.

[3] "Segregation and Stratification" in Social Living, op. cit., pp. 45-47.

[4] Social Living, op. cit., p. 45.

[5] "A Christian Approach to the Alcoholic Beverage Question" in Social Living, op. cit., pp. 59-70.

[6] "Religious Faith and Public Office" in Social Living, op. cit., pp. 74-75.

[7] "Responsible Parenthood" and "Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage" in Social Living, op. cit., pp. 9-12 and 16-21 respectively.

American Lutheranism, Lloyd Svendsbye notes that Reuss' work in the problems of family life "must be included among the most significant pioneering efforts on the part of Lutheranism in the field of social ethics."[1]

Thus, by the time of the merger with the Evangelical Lutheran Church and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1960, the American Lutheran Church under the leadership of Reuss had rejected its former quietism and had assumed responsibility for addressing itself to social, economic, and political questions. Such problems were no longer viewed as merely the chastisement of God to be accepted with patience and thanksgiving, but as challenges for change by the active involvement of Christian citizens.

The statements formulated by the Board for Christian Social Action and circulated in the American Lutheran Church generally espoused a moderate to liberal political point of view. The positions also usually reflected careful sociological analysis. There were times, however, when the political realism of the statements was less than adequate, especially in the interaction of sociological analysis and theology, the marked individualism of the anticipated response, and the sole concentration upon education as the means for action. With respect to the interaction of social analysis and theology, the statements attempted to show Christian relevance by a method of proof-texting, or marshalling a series of Bible verses as props in support of an argument frequently arrived at by non-biblical means. The rather "wooden and mechanical" theology which resulted, along with its meshing of "a high providentialism and moral responsibility" did justice neither to the facts of the situation nor to the Christian tradition.[1] In international relations, for instance, moral principles were urged as a replacement for self-interest.[2] Consideration of the socially-useful role of conflict, compromise, and self-interest, the structures and social origins of injustice, the tension between love and any form of relative justice, and the existence of the institutional church under God's realm of law were generally absent from the statements. Life was viewed as a rational and harmonious process. Although the reality of sin was constantly mentioned, the tragic conflict between its reality and the sense of a rational and harmonious process was not seriously entertained. It should be noted, though, that the Board for Christian Social Action received little support from the theological seminaries of the church.[3] In fact, "the official theological leadership of the American Lutheran Church remained fairly aloof from the social action movement."[4]

---

[1] Svendsbye, op. cit., pp. 266-67.

---

1. Ibid., p. 285.

2. Cf. "The International Crisis" in Social Living, op. cit., p. 81.

3. Svendsbye, op. cit., pp. 250-51.

4. Ibid., pp. 285-86.

Social and political quietism was part of the heritage which Lutheran immigrants brought to the United States. The rural and linguistic isolation of a majority of Lutherans and their theological rejection of the Social Gospel allowed the Lutheran concentration upon individual conversion and charity essentially to remain unchallenged until the Second World War. Even the Depression had little effect upon pastoral exhortations to patience in the midst of adversity and to tolerance of the status quo. But inter-Lutheran cooperation in the National Lutheran Council and the American Lutheran Conference were signs in the 1930's of a coming change.

The movement from "moral welfare" to "broadening concern for social issues" which came to many other Protestant denominations in the 1930's did not have much effect in the Lutheran churches until the 1940's.[1] The United Lutheran Church in America, followed by the Augustana Lutheran Church, was the leader in the social development among the Lutheran groups. While both churches had agencies concerned with public issues in the 1930's, indeed the United Lutheran Church since 1918, the issue of war and peace in the early 1940's marked the first significant shift toward the assumption of responsibility for the social order. The United Lutheran Church engaged full-time staff in 1946 to guide the development including the explication of a social ethic relevant to the Lutheran tradition and relevant to the emerging social and political issues.

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 2, p. 14f.

Of the churches merging into the present American Lutheran Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the Lutheran Free Church underwent very little development. All three churches evidence increasing attention to public questions, but none had quite reached the phase of "broadening concern for social issues." The former American Lutheran Church was the only one of the merging churches that had clearly advanced beyond the concerns of "moral welfare." Under the leadership of the Board of Christian Social Action and Carl Reuss, the American Lutheran Church gradually assumed its responsibility in the solution of social, economic, and political problems. The work of the board reflected careful sociological analysis. However, the board presupposed the adequacy of individual vis-a-vis corporate action and relied solely upon education and moral suasion as the means by which to effect change. While the churches periodically adopted stands on political and social questions and the stands were sometimes communicated to congressmen, even the American Lutheran Church made little effort to influence national legislation. The churches did not consciously operate as political interest groups. The social idealism of the statements still required the infusion of political realism. Also, the manner in which theology and social analysis were interrelated did justice to neither discipline. Yet in spite of these shortcomings the American Lutheran Church had rejected the quietism of its heritage and was ready to guide the development of social responsibility in the merger of 1960. Transformationism was beginning to replace the separationism that had so long characterized American Lutheranism.

Chapter V

THE POLITICAL ROLE OF THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH[1]

The new American Lutheran Church, resulting from the merger of the former American Lutheran Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1960, joined by the Lutheran Free Church in 1963, essentially continued the political role which had been developed in the former American Lutheran Church. Like its predecessors, the ALC understood its mission primarily in terms of the individual transformation of persons to a life in Christian faith. Only the former American Lutheran Church had made serious attempts to consider the implications of Christian faith for social, economic, and political questions. But even its efforts were directed at the motivation of individual action rather than corporate political activity on the part of the national church body.

The new church contained a successor unit to the Board of Christian Social Action in the former American Lutheran Church. Led by Carl Reuss, the executive director of the

---

[1] Hereafter the American Lutheran Church will frequently be identified by the letters, ALC.

XUM

former Board for Christian Social Action, the Commission on Research and Social Action has guided the development of the ALC's understanding of its social responsibility.

The ALC has adopted a cautious approach to political involvement. Strictly speaking, it has undertaken very little direct political action. Generally it has looked to individual members of the church for expression of political concerns. However, from time to time events have challenged this limited political approach. But while the ALC has gradually adopted a more positive stance with respect to its corporate social role, the character of the ALC's political involvement remains essentially unchanged since the merger.[1]

A Limited Political Role

The Constitution and Bylaws of the ALC include two broad social objectives to guide the church: "[s]tudy the problems of contemporary life and society in the light of the Word of God, in order to make its [that is, the church's] contribution toward solving these problems" and "[d]evelop programs for the promotion of human welfare. . . ."[1] While these objectives are guides for the entire church, the first of the two objectives has been considered as a special mandate to the Commission on Research and Social Action. Only recently has the second objective been given renewed consideration.[2]

---

[1] In an interview on July 9, 1969, Carl Reuss indicated that since the merger in 1960 the Commission on Research and Social Action had generally been covering the same ground in the ALC that the Board for Christian Social Action had covered in the former American Lutheran Church. The effort of the Commission has been to give legitimacy for church involvement in social, economic, and political issues. Reuss also noted that in certain respects the new church was still behind the former American Lutheran Church. For example, the latter had undertaken considerable work in the area of church and economic life and had employed staff to develop the area. This specialized staff was not continued in the merger.

More specifically, the Constitution specifies that the objectives of the Commission on Research and Social Action are "to apply the Gospel to the social problems of the day, and to assist the boards and agencies of the Church in making their programs relevant to the changing attitudes of society, through continuing study of social trends and problems."[3] The By-laws list three specific tasks for the Commission.[4] First, the Commission is to "[p]repare studies and evaluations of pertinent social problems and issues in order to stimulate thinking and promote discussion within the Church." Second, it is to "[c]arry out special research projects at the request of the Church or any of its boards." Finally, the Commission is to "[p]repare statements, with the approval of the Church Council, concerning problems on which the Church should speak, for release to governmental and other appropriate agencies." The By-laws further indicate that any statements based upon Commission studies or social analysis intended for the policy guidance of the church also are subject to the approval of the Church Council. Thus the Commission on Research and Social Action has primary responsibility for guiding the ALC on social, political, and economic issues. Only in a few instances have other departments of the church engaged in this endeavor.[1]

---

[1] The Constitution and By-Laws of the American Lutheran Church, 302.5 and 302.6 in Handbook of the American Lutheran Church, 1969 ed. ([Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1969]), p. 34.

[2] Cf. Chapter 7, p. 231f.

[3] Constitution and By-Laws of the American Lutheran Church, op. cit., 1403.2, p. 91.

[4] Ibid., 1440.3, p. 92.

Constitutionally, the political role of the Commission is indirect. The political effect of the Commission is primarily through the discussion of social issues in the church. Direct political action is the special prerogative of the Church Council and the General Conventions. As will be seen later in this study, efforts at direct political action by these units have been minimal. On certain questions the ALC has looked to the National Lutheran Council and more recently to its successor, the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., for leadership on national problems.[2]

---

1. Only four instances in which other boards engaged in this activity were discovered. In 1966 the Board of Pensions endorsed the mandatory inclusion of ministers under Social Security on a self-employed basis. Minutes of the Board of Pensions, May 17, 1966, pp. 32-33. In 1969 the Board of Social Service directed its executive director and the board secretary to urge the Congress to provide full funding for Title VII, Section 707, of the Manpower Training Act. Minutes of the Board of Social Service, June 2-3, 1969, p. 317. Also in 1969 the Board of Trustees cooperated with the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. in the preparation of testimony to the House Ways and Means Committee concerning the proposed federal tax reform measures. Minutes of the Board of Trustees, February 24-25, 1969 pp. 22-23, and June 5-6, 1969, p. 7. The Board of Trustees also authorized, upon the strong urging of President Schiotz, a grant of $1,000 to the Institute for American Democracy. Minutes of the Board of Trustees, June 5-6, 1969, p. 16. The Institute is an organization which works against extremism.

2. Cf. Chapter 6, pp. 170-71.

Unlike its predecessor, the Commission on Research and Social Action does not operate as a major program division within the ALC. Most programs of the church are directed by semi-independent division boards elected by and responsible to the biennial General Conventions.[1] But the Commission is elected by and is responsible to the Church Council, the chief legislative arm of the church between General Conventions.

The Commission on Research and Social Action has taken the lead in defining the church's social and political role. Essentially this role envisions that the church should analyze social problems and trends, suggest courses of action for individual members, encourage pastors and laymen to become symbolic voices in the church, and develop consensual policy statements on social issues from time to time. The church generally regards other forms of corporate involvement warily and continues to view direct political action on the part of the corporate church with deep misgivings. This political and social approach of the ALC has been expressed

---

1. Constitutionally, the division boards of the ALC are responsible to the General Conventions. In practice, however, the Convention agenda allows little opportunity for delegate examination of board policy. There is no attempt to prevent discussion of policy, but delegates generally do not have adequate background and information to enter into intelligent discussion of policy. As a result, boards tend to operate relatively independently of the General Convetions. In contrast, the Church Council, meeting at least once and sometimes twice a year, scrutinizes the work of the Commission on Research and Social Action, names the Commission members, and approves the appointment of Commission staff.

XUM

in a number of documents, including the Commission's report to the 1962 General Convention;[1] "The Church's Role in Society," a social policy statement commended for study by the 1966 General Convention;[2] and "Our Approach to Social Involvement," an official policy statement adopted by the 1968 General Convention.[3]

In the report to the 1962 General Convention the Commission claimed that its concern was to help Christians realize that social and political action is an outgrowth of Christian faith. It saw as its central task the responsibility to further "an understanding of (1) social trends and problems as these are seen in the light of God's Word, (2) ways in which the whole counsel of God can be spoken the more effectively to a rapidly changing society, and (3) proper response of Christians toward correcting and overcoming current social problems." The Commission asserted it was promoting a "concept" rather

---

1. "Report of the Commission on Research and Social Action," Reports and Actions, 1962, pp. 355-56. The section has been reprinted as "A Hard Look at Our Task."

2. Reports and Actions, 1966, pp. 479-87. The statement was circulated in a separate printing by the Commission on Research and Social Action under the title of the statement. Over 75,000 copies were circulated in the ALC from the beginning of 1967 through mid-1969. Cf. Appendix, Table 1, Part IX, p. 343. The citations below are taken from the separate printing of the statement. Hereafter ALC social policy statements will be identified only by their title. Other information on the statement is included in the bibliography.

3. Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 463-65.

than a "program." The Commission report considered action as the personal responsibility of the individual member:

> He listens to and evaluates what he hears from all sides, including those who speak only for their own self-interest. He avoids uncritical acceptance of any point of view or any one set of data. He looks to his church to guide, counsel, teach, and admonish him as to what it believes his response should be to specific problems and opportunities. How he actually responds is his decision, for which he alone is personally and individually accountable directly to God.

The report noted that while church members can expect social and theological analysis of issues, "[t]he Christian has not delegated to his church the responsibility of speaking in his behalf to controversial social, political, and economic issues on which God's Word permits differing interpretations." The church is to speak to and not for its members.[1] This position was subsequently endorsed by the 1964 General Convention in the social policy statement, "Church-State Relations in the U.S.A.":

---

[1] In a memorandum dated October 13, 1965, to an interdepartmental consultation on adult Christian education in the ALC, Carl Reuss noted that the purpose of the Commission on Research and Social Action was "to stimulate thinking and promote discussion among adults of The ALC on current social issues. Toward this end it offers what it believes to be honest and accurate analyses of the problem of issues under study, which are theologically valid within the Lutheran tradition, and suggests avenues of appropriate personal and corporate action. It tries to avoid leaving the impression that its conclusions are the Christian answer; in humility it recognized that equally conscientious and earnest Christians may differ in their understanding of what commitment to Christ requires of them in specific social circumstances." He stated that on most issues the Commission would seek no "official" church position. "Here it hopes to involve not particularly the 'official structures' but the interested and articulate laity, challenging them to think through the implications of their faith for guiding their life in the secular community." The memorandum is included as Appendix A to "Report of the Executive Director to the Commission on Research and Social Action" for meeting on May 19-20, 1966.

> While we dare not surrender our prophetic office, as a Lutheran church we normally do not seek to tell governing authorities how they should govern, or to prescribe the specific details of the laws they should pass. This task we leave to the enlightened, sensitive consciences of citizens and public officials, many of them our brethren in the faith. Our task as a church is to speak the whole counsel of God to our members, helping them thereby, with the power of the Holy Spirit, to be better informed, sensitively Christian citizens actively working for a better community, nation, and world.[1]

This same general stance was articulated in the statement, "The Church's Role in Society." There the responsibility of the church to analyze the trends of society and to discern the meaning of God's law for current problems was affirmed. Such efforts were to help church members better to understand their individual responsibility to engage in social reform. The church, according to the statement, "has no special power to rule over secular society."[2] Rather "[i]ts secular influence comes clearest when redeemed children of God, walking in faith, love, and good works, participate with wisdom and conviction in their various offices in secular society." Seven avenues of involvement for the ALC were defined in the statement:

> a. [Analysis of] the issues causing tension and the values in conflict in the world, enlisting its keenest minds from among involved laity and discerning pastors to cut through to the heart of the issue,

---

[1] Para. 32.

[2] "The Church's Role in Society," p. 7.

> exposing the good and the evil, the sinful and the wholesome, that are in contention;
>
> b. [Evaluation of] the effects of current social trends upon persons individually, upon persons in their relationships with one another, and upon the ability of the various institutions and structures of society effectively to fulfill their special functions within the community;
>
> c. [Discernment and communication of] the meaning of the Gospel for the rapidly changing human situation, taking care not to wrench Scripture out of context to make it support man's prejudices;
>
> d. [Clarification of] the goals and objectives for man and community toward which social planning should move, as well as the values and criteria by which men can judge the wisdom and wholesomeness of measures for civic righteousness;
>
> e. [Education of] its members to act with knowledge, conviction, honor, and wisdom in their various offices, as Christians striving to accomplish God's purposes for justice, mercy, opportunity, peace, truth, freedom, and responsible relationships one with another in the family of mankind;
>
> f. [Fortification of] these members in their ministry in society, communicating its willingness to serve as pastor, guide, counselor, brother or sister, in working through with them the decisions they must reach as they faithfully seek to be Christ's disciples in the structures of society;
>
> g. [Resistance to] any and every effort which would make the church captive of a particular class, political, economic, racial, national, or ideological interest, keeping itself free to proclaim that counsel and bear that witness which it believes its Lord expects of His church.

The Commission also has lauded the "symbolic voices" of individual pastors and laymen as the church at work. The Commission's 1962 report stated:

> The church speaks most plainly and directly to its members through its legions of faithful, dedicated, and competent pastors. Especially in their sermons, but also in their teaching and confirmation instruction, in their counseling and pastoral activity, in

XUM

> their speeches and addresses, in their lives and example, the clergy of the church deeply influence the thinking and responses of the members of the church to the meaning of God's Word for today's life in community.

The report indicated the Commission's intention to serve as a resource to the pastors, providing ideas and interpretive data on social issues and trends. The statement, "The Church's Role in Society," also called for prophetic guidance from pastors and strongly defended the "freedom of the pulpit" for the expression of unpopular convictions.

In accord with its conviction that individual pastors and laymen are better agents than the corporate church for political action, the ALC has given special encouragement to civic involvement. ALC members have been encouraged to participate in the political process through political parties, community organization, and, where necessary, even public demonstrations.[1] The Commission also has issued study documents which have discussed the theological basis of social and political action,[2] ethical perspectives for social action,[1] and the creative use of conflict.[2] Clergy endorsement of political candidates in 1960 and again in 1968, however, caused the Church Council in its June 1968 meeting to caution against the use of institutional identification in the endorsement of political candidates.[3] In this regard it is interesting to note that some of the executive directors of ALC departments have identified themselves as church officials when they expressed personal political views, although not when they endorsed candidates.[4]

---

[1] Cf. "Christians in Politics" (1966); "Christian Social Action Through Public Witness" (1964); "The Church's Role in Society" (1966); and "Public Authority, Dissent, and Civil Disobedience" (1969). The Commission also has issued two guides for congregational social concerns: "Congregations Alert for Social Action" in 1963 and "Guide for the Social Concerns Committee" in 1968.

[2] Kenneth P. Alpers, Bases for Lutheran Social Action (Minneapolis: Commission on Research and Social Action, 1965) and Philip J. Hefner, Theological Perspectives on Social Ministry (Minneapolis: Commission on Research and Social Action, 1968). These and other brief studies commended by the Commission on Research and Social Action do not necessarily represent ALC social policy. In most cases, however, the content of such studies has been examined by the Commission.

In its 1962 General Convention report the Commission indicated its dissatisfaction with most forms of corporate political action: "The church loses its unique character when it enters the arena of politics and economics as one among many power blocs, pressure groups, and special interests." It did allow for the possibility of social policy statements, however. The Commission emphasized that corporate testimony, "to be effective, ought to represent a meaningful consensus of the membership, based on adequate opportunity to study the issue prior to the date of corporate decision." It proposed that district committees on research and social action, pastoral conferences, and district conventions be involved in the drafting process. Finally, it noted that social resolutions should be the culmination rather than the starting point of church study of an issue.

---

[1] Arthur Becker, Making Ethical Judgments in a Changing World (Minneapolis: Commission on Research and Social Action, 1966).

[2] Richard Husfloen, Conflict and Its Creative Dynamics in Church and Society (Minneapolis: Commission on Research and Social Action, 1969).

[3] "Institutional Identification in Political Endorsements" (1969).

[4] A majority of the interviewed executive directors had communicated their views to government officials on one or more occasions. Most emphasized, however, that in any such communication they indicated the personal character of the view, even though their church position was used. No director had used his office in support of a candidate, although some of them were active in local political activities. Two men had been candidates for office themselves, including David Preus, the vice president of the ALC, who is a member of the Minneapolis School Board.

Corporate political activity was again stated in cautious terms in "The Church's Role in Society." The reserved stance was even evident in the section caption, "If Direct Involvement Is Indicated."[1] In fact, the entire paragraph concerning corporate resolutions was cast in disparaging language:

> The typical convention resolution, unless preceded by careful study that tries to define issues and achieve a consensus, has little social significance. So far as secular authorities are concerned, ordinary convention resolutions are "a dime a dozen." Only if it is evident that they are the product of genuine study are they likely to be taken seriously as a significant expression of public opinion. Even supposing that extensive study has preceded the vote, a corporate resolution adopted by a convention vote of, say, 719 to 281, may not be particularly convincing to the world because of the strong minority view. Or, a convention statement which wins universal support from a democratic assembly may say almost nothing controversial because it has been so watered down as to mean all things to all men. Thus it has little power or influence, even though it may cause "sons of the resolution" to think that they have acted well. Moreover, the church is handicapped when it seeks to speak prophetically as a democratic

---

[1] Underscoring added.

> assembly. The voice of the Lord is not subject to a majority vote. Even the minority of one in a thousand must be protected when, despite earnest discussion seeking to provide information, clarify issues and sensitize consciences he remains convinced that his position is that which his Lord would have him take.[1]

On the other hand, the president of the ALC, Fredrik A. Schiotz, has strongly defended the right of and the necessity for the church to express its convictions in social policy statements. He contends that "[t]he church must take the risk of sometimes being wrong or sometimes acting without a full consensus if the problems at hand are of such clear nature as to compel action."[2] Rhetorically he asks: "Who is to sensitize the conscience of Americans if the church does not do so?"[3] Because of its mission, he claims, the church cannot avoid speaking out.[1]

---

[1] The Church Council changed the first three sentences to read: "The typical convention resolution, so far as secular authorities are concerned, has little impact. However, when a convention resolution has been preceded by careful advance study, and when its adoption genuinely reflects a consensus built upon the educational process within the organization, a convention resolution can become a highly significant expression of public opinion and thus a potential influence upon public policy. Yet, undue reliance must not be placed upon church convention resolution." Minutes of the Church Council, June 22-25, 1966, pp. 20-21. The General Convention approved the change recommended by the Church Council. Cf. Reports and Actions, 1966, p. 484. Following the General Convention, however, Carl Reuss circulated the proposed statement with the original language approved by the Commission. The Commission version is cited above because that version was the one circulated in the church.

[2] "Churches Have Right to Speak Says Schiotz at WCC Meeting," The Lutheran Standard, May 31, 1966, p. 22.

[3] Fredrik Schiotz, "Who Is to Sensitize the Conscience?," The Lutheran Standard, February 18, 1969, p. 15.

"The Church's Role in Society" upheld the right of congregations to allow their facilities to be used for orderly public meetings, however unpopular the cause espoused at such a meeting. It even recognized that "[t]here may be times and circumstances when churches and their members may need to initiate marches, picketing, and other totally legal means for dramatizing injustice and protecting unwholesome social situations." The statement recognized the possibility of organized church participation in civil disobedience, but it rejected participation in riots, insurrection, killing, wounding, pillaging, looting, or burning. It pointed to both possible positive and negative effects of civil disobedience, concluding that individuals must reach their own decision or involvement after consideration of the consequences of the proposed action. It should be noted, however, that these comments were addressed primarily to congregations and to individual members and not to the ALC as a national church organization.

It was not until 1968 that corporate social and political involvement of the church was considered in a positive manner alongside supportive approaches. The social policy statement, "Our Approach to Social Involvement," stated matter-of-factly that "[t]imes and circumstances may cause the corporate church at its several levels to decide that faithfulness to

---

[1] Fredrik Shiotz, "Shall the Church Speak Out?," The Lutheran Standard, May 17, 1966, p. 17+.

Jesus Christ requires corporate involvement in specific social issues or problem situations." As types of action the policy statement noted:

> a. Express[ion of] its convictions in a resolution or statement adopted by a delegated assembly;
>
> b. Deploy[ment of] funds and manpower in pursuit of goals it deems essential to faithful discipleship;
>
> c. Encourage[ment of] its personnel in positions of trust and leadership to speak and to act as Spirit-enlightened wisdom guides them;
>
> d. Establish[ment of] and mainten[ance of] institutions and agencies for dealing in reconciling and healing ways with issues or situations the church defines as critical;
>
> e. [Establishment of] corporate relationships with other religious or civic organizations committed to achieving objectives the church regards as basic to effective civic righteousness.

"Our Approach to Social Involvement" urged the following guides for corporate action:

> The corporate church should rely upon its knowledgeable and articulate members for shaping ecclesiastical policies and positions on sensitive issues. Whatever the corporate church decides to do, however, must be consistent with its recognition of the organizational pluralism and proper functions of the several institutions of society, its disavowal of any claims to exercise control over the non-religious institutions, and its acceptance of its own unique role as the avenue for God's mediating and reconciling Means of Grace.

Even with this advance, however, the introductory section of the statement pointed to the overriding concern for individual action. While the church was recognized as both an organized corporate body and the people of God at work in the world, the task of the "organized corporate body" still pointed in the direction of aiding "the people of God at work in the world" to do their individual work:

> The corporate church equips its members for mission. It assists, strengthens, and upholds them in their ministry. But, the corporate church neither takes over their mission nor substitutes for them in their ministry. The corporate church best involves itself in the issues of society when in its teaching, pastoral, and fellowship roles it prepares its members to take their places warmly, wisely, and responsibly in their various offices in secular society.

The Limited Role Exemplified

The restricted political role which the ALC has conceived for itself is not only outlined in the church's documents but is also evident from an examination of its activities.

Almost all of the efforts of the Commission on Research and Social Action are directed at the preparation of study materials on social issues and problems. While the Commission staff and at times Commission members have represented the Commission at various national meetings, usually for the purpose of maintaining an ALC "presence," the main efforts of the Commission are devoted to the preparation of printed study materials for use by pastors and lay study groups in the congregations. Consistent with its constitutional authority, the Commission has engaged on its own in very few activities of a strictly political nature.

The same is true for district committees on research and social action. District committees were organized to

XUM

operate in a manner similar to the Commission. While responsible to the districts of the church, these committees were developed under the leadership of the Commission staff. Commission guidelines for the district committees instructed them "to foster among members of the district the study and understanding of problems of contemporary life and society as these are illuminated by the Word of God, and to guide them in constructive action to the solution of these problems."[1] The committees were specifically encouraged to study and express reactions to Commission statements, keep members informed on state legislative activities, and assist other district committees in making their activities more responsive to current social problems and issues. No direct political role was envisioned for the district committees. Official positions were reserved to the annual district conventions.

As to its own political activities, the Commission on Research and Social Action distributed the record of Congressional votes on key issues to district committees, district presidents, and others upon request.[2] Due to some critical letters and the lack of evidence pertaining to the usefulness of the materials, the practice was not repeated.[1] The only instance of a Commission appeal to a group outside of the ALC was a request, issued through the office of the president of the church, to the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches to investigate alleged persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union and to take action dictated by the findings.[2] The Commission acted in response to a request for assistance from the Anti-Defamation League.

---

[1] "Suggested By-Laws for District Committees on Research and Social Action," adopted November 3-4, 1959, by the Commission on Research and Social Action as guides for the operation of the district committees.

[2] Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Commission on Research and Social Action, May 10, 1962, pp. 2-3.

The Commission has frequently looked to the National Lutheran Council and its successor, the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., for leadership in politically-oriented activities. Representatives have annually been sent by the Commission to the Churchmen's Washington Seminar conducted by the Washington staffs of the cooperating denominations, including the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., in order to acquaint churchmen with the processes of government. The Commission, in fact, has been committed to the position that Lutherans should seek to make the inter-Lutheran agency the single Lutheran spokesman to the non-Lutheran public.[3] Beginning in 1964, it gave Robert Van

---

[1] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, November 30, 1962, p. 7. Interview with Carl Reuss on July 9, 1969.

[2] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, March 13-14, p. 6.

[3] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, March 23, 1962, p. 2. The Commission has declined certain requests because of its belief that the inter-Lutheran agency should operate on behalf of all Lutherans. In 1961 it decided against accepting a Methodist invitation to use the Methodist UN office as a Lutheran UN seminar center. Cf. Minutes of the

Deusen, director of the Washington Office of Public Affairs of the Lutheran Council, a standing invitation to attend the meetings of the Commission as liaison staff.[1]

Because the Commission was required to avoid giving the impression that it represented the ALC to the non-ALC public, it has been reluctant to establish formal relationships with other civic organizations. The Commission decided in the beginning that it would not generally take out agency memberships in organizations.[2] It agreed to finance a personal membership for the director only where the primary purpose was to receive publications of the organization.

The Commission's contacts with non-ALC groups have been especially cautious when political action has been involved. In 1961, for example, it even declined to participate with other religious groups in an interview with President Kennedy, a meeting intended to mobilize support for disarmament.[3] The

---

Commission, June 23, 1961, p. 4. In 1964 it referred a request of the National Council of Churches for financial support for a Peace Corps Desk to the National Lutheran Council. Cf. Minutes of the Commission, December 4-5, 1964, p. 7.

[1] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, December 4-5, 1964, p. 8.

[2] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, February 27-28, 1961, p. 6. Reuss stated in an interview on July 9, 1969, that as the purpose of the Commission was to speak to rather than for the ALC, any formal ties to other organizations would tend to commit the Commission to the positions, aims, and objectives of other agencies in violation of the Commission's purpose. The Commission has made few exceptions to this policy.

[3] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, June 23, 1961, p. 4.

refusal was based on the argument that the ALC had no policy resolution on disarmament which authorized such participation. In regard to several invitations to participate in meetings for the support of civil rights legislation in 1963, the Commission emphasized

> that constitutionally it cannot represent The ALC at any meetings where the primary purpose is to marshall support for or opposition to specific legislation, but that it could send observers who would report back to the Commission and the church the information they had gleaned. The Commission properly can and should encourage study and debate on proposed legislation, can clarify and endorse the aims and objectives it feels should be sought, and can encourage members of the church to take firm, responsible action consistent with their Christian faith, all without unqualified support for or opposition to specific bills in the legislative hopper.[1]

Perhaps the best illustration of the Commission's hesitancy is reflected in its contacts with the National Council of Churches. Soon after the merger, the Church Council determined that since the ALC was not a member of the National Council of Churches, individual ALC departments could accept membership in divisions of the National Council only with the expressed approval of the Church Council. ALC departments,

---

1. Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, October 3, 1963, pp. 3-4. In "Report of the Executive Director to the Commission on Research and Social Action," for the meeting in October, 1963, Reuss recommended: "That we should encourage study and debate on this proposed legislation, that we should endorse such aims as equality of opportunity and equality of justice, and that we should encourage our people to take firm, responsible action consistent with their Christian faith I heartily agree. That we should lend our efforts to lobbying for specific legislation I feel is beyond our competence as a Commission." P. 4.

however, were authorized to establish unofficial working relationships with units of the National Council. The Commission on Research and Social Action requested its director to continue his National Council relationships[1] and even urged his membership in the Department of Religious Liberty of the National Council.[2] Shortly thereafter, however, Reuss resigned from the Department of Religious Liberty due to its strong opposition to the film, Operation Abolition, which supported the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as well as its lobbying efforts for federal aid to education.[3] In 1962 the Commission decided, due to what it considered one-sidedness of official messages of conferences sponsored by the National Council of Churches, to send observers rather than official representatives to the National Study Conference on the Church and Economic Life sponsored by the National Council's Department of Church and Economic Life.[4]

Reuss has been dissatisfied with the operational approach of the National Council. While recognizing the useful functions which it performs, he has contended that

---

[1] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, September 16-17, 1960, p. 5.

[2] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, February 27-29, 1961, p. 7.

[3] Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Commission on Research and Social Action, September 14, 1961, pp. 4-5.

[4] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, March 23, 1962, p. 4.

> in the sensitive area of social action, it seems to me that the philosophy represented by most of the bodies participating in the National Council of Churches is different from that of The American Lutheran Church. Therefore, the very fact of our participation tends to comit [sic!] us to approaches, methods, and viewpoints to which we can express only minority views and which minority views usually are ignored in the final positions taken.[1]

He urged the Commission that until the ALC became a member of the National Council "our Commission should refrain from direct or indirect membership" in any of its units,[2] a position which the Commission subsequently took.[3]

In accordance with this position, Reuss declined to participate on the preparatory commission for the 1964 National Study Conference on Church and State sponsored by the National Council of Churches, although the Commission eventually participated in the conference itself.[4] The Commission, however, refused to furnish copies of the proposed ALC social policy statement, "Toward an American Lutheran Position on Church-State

---

[1] "Report of the Executive Director to the Commission on Research and Social Action" for the meeting on March 23, 1962, p. 6.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, March 23, 1962, p. 4. President Schiotz, on the other hand, does not fully share this criticism of the National Council of Churches. He recognizes that a number of participants are frequently absent when statements are adopted and believes that the National Council tends to adopt too many statements, sometimes under staff pressure. But he believes the process which the National Council of Churches uses for the adoption of policy positions is sound. Interview, October 10, 1969.

[4] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, September 22, 1962, p. 6; Minutes of the Commission, March 8-9, 1963, p. 5.

Relations in the U.S.A.," to conference participants.[1] The Commission contended that "until a document has been given final approval by the Commission it should be distributed only within ALC circles, provided, however, that the director may distribute single copies upon specific request but with the specific warning that the statement may not be published or quoted."[2] Since then the Commission has continued to participate in several National Council-sponsored meetings, but has postponed any further consideration of possible Commission membership of the National Council of Churches until the ALC considers the question at its 1970 General Convention.[3]

In a recent evaluation of the work of the Commission, Reuss reiterated his reluctance to participate in the political and social activities of the National Council of Churches:

> Different church bodies take a different stance on social involvement. Specifically, the N.C.C. stance in social issues is different from that of The ALC. We can and do learn from the positions the NCC and its member communions take on issues. We do attend significant NCC-sponsored conferences. Perhaps by repeated and insistent participation in NCC divisions we could make our viewpoint heard, that there is no one "party line" which committed

---

1. Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Commission on Research and Social Action, May 17, 1963, p. 3; Minutes of the Commission, October 3, 1963, p. 3.

2. In an interview on July 9, 1969, Carl Reuss indicated his disagreement with this decision. He believed that the ALC was adequately protected by the notation on the proposed statement disclaiming any official status at the time.

3. Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, May 2-4, 1968, p. 4.

> Christians must take on economic, social, or political questions. The costs in time and energies of staff and in innumerable trips to New York to participate vigorously in committee work are such that we have decided that these costs outweigh the possible gains. Accordingly we limit ourselves to major conferences and occasional participation in interdenominational social education and action staff meetings.[1]

Reuss has contrasted the work of the Commission with the National Council and with other denominations, including the Lutheran Church in America.[2] He noted that the Commission

> stands outside the mainline Protestant tradition of social action methodology. It does not agree with the NCC stance and practice. While the Commission tries to keep informed on NCC and mainline Protestant church positions in the areas of personal and family living, work and economic life, community relations, national and international affairs, and the church as a social institution, it does not associate itself with them.

He described the ALC efforts as educational rather than lobbying in nature. The Commission, he said,

> sees the prime role of the church as a teaching, counseling, equipping, supporting arm for its members. It believes that they have not delegated to their ecclesiastical organization the task of representing them before governmental bodies. Rather, it encourages its members to participate strongly and wisely in the structures of secular society so as to become lights and leaven for civic righteousness.

But he was aware, however, that a "vocal minority in the church protests this view as outmoded and ineffective." Reuss stressed that the Commission tried to be representative rather than prophetic:

---

[1] "Report of the Commission on Research and Social Action to the Long Range Study Committee," July, 1967, p. 4.

[2] "Report of the Commission on Research and Social Action to IDEAS," January, 1967, pp. 5-6.

> The Commission seeks to give fair representation and credence to the various viewpoints extant in the church. Realistically it strives to express a responsible consensus, broadly representative of the mainstream of the church. Persons at either extreme are unlikely to be able to accept the conclusions it reaches. The Commission feels it cannot adopt a single-minded, one-sided approach. Thus it rarely will be "prophetic," in the sense that it unilaterally invokes God's wrath upon persons or causes it condemns. Individuals can speak extreme views; a genuinely representative group must express a consensus.

The Commission also has been reluctant to have the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. cooperate with other religious groups in political action. Increasingly, the Washington-based staffs of the churches have been cooperating in attempts to improve their political effectiveness. When Van Deusen of the Lutheran Council's Washington Office of Public Affairs reported in early 1969 on cooperative efforts to organize an interdenominational political action network in congressional districts, conduct a number of legislative assemblies, and develop joint strategy for the influencing of legislation, the Commission expressed its unwillingness to participate in the activities.[1] It further expressed its belief that Van Deusen should not participate in such activities as a representative of only one or another of the churches in the Lutheran Council. Since that time, however, the Lutheran Council itself has authorized Van Deusen's involvement in the Washington interreligious cooperative efforts and has even helped fund establishment of the political response network in the congressional districts.[1]

---

[1] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, January 9-11, 1969, p. 4.

The ALC's cautious approach to political action also is reflected in the Commission's 1963 dispute with the Church Council regarding the latter's adoption of several social policy positions without the prior involvement of the Commission.[2] While the Commission argued that such action undermined its work since members of the ALC could properly assume that the Commission had been consulted prior to the adoption of statements, it was especially concerned about what it regarded as Church Council disregard of Commission prerogatives, the erroneous factual basis of one of the Church Council actions,[3] and the tendency of the Church Council to speak on behalf of rather than to ALC members.[4] Addressing the Church

---

[1] Interview with Robert Van Deusen, October 28, 1969.

[2] According to the "Report of the Commission on Research and Social Action to the Church Council," May 1, 1963, p. 5, the issues involved Church Council action on federal tax deductions ("Income Tax Deductibility of Church Contributions" [1963]), therapeutic abortion ("Therapeutic Abortion"[1963]), federal aid for church institutions ("Federal Aid for Church Institutions" [1962]), and the religious factor in elections ("Religious Faith as a Factor in American Elections" [1961]). Both President Schiotz and Carl Reuss indicated in interviews on October 10, 1969, and July 9, 1969, respectively, that the consideration of such issues by the Church Council apart from the Commission was a pattern carried over from the former Evangelical Lutheran Church. That church body did not have a unit comparable to the Commission and its Church Council adopted policy statements.

[3] The statement on tax deductions contained erroneous information and had to be revised. Cf. Minutes of the Church Council, June 28-29, 1963, p. 41.

[4] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, March 8-9, 1963, pp. 2-3.

Council, the Commission stated:

> Any statement of the corporate church which purports to express a policy or position on any social issue, whether at the level of the Church Council or the Convention, to be meaningful ought to reflect a genuine consensus, manifested perhaps by a two-thirds majority vote of those present and voting. Any such statement, furthermore, ought to speak factually and precisely, seeking to increase public understanding while respecting differing views, and support positive convictions consistent with the essential task of the church.
>
> The church needs ever to be alert to the danger that its corporate resolutions on social trends and problems will appear to the world to be not cries for justice, mercy, truth, and righteousness but mere pleas for the protection of the church as a social institution or the legislative imposition of its dogma upon non-believers.[1]

The Church Council responded by assuring the Commission that thereafter it would normally consult with the Commission before making any statements on social issues.[2] The Church Council, however, has continued the practice of adopting social policy statements without consultation with the Commission.[3]

---

[1] "Report of the Commission on Research and Social Action to the Church Council," May 1, 1963, p. 5.

[2] The Church Council resolved that it would normally consult with the Commission before making statements on social issues, acknowledged that studies submitted by the Commission to the district committees for evaluation could not be withheld from the press, and authorized the Executive Director of the Commission to disclaim any statements issued by the Social Trends Committee of the National Council of Churches. Minutes of the Church Council, June 28-29, 1963, p. 38.

[3] Positions subsequently adopted by the Church Council without prior Commission involvement have included the question of holding national elections on weekends ("Change of National Election Days" [1963]), support for a religious census ("Religious Census" [1963]), opposition to compulsory chapel attendance at the military academies ("Compulsory Attendance at Worship Services at Military Academies" [1964]), the inclusion of

A final example of the cautious ALC approach to social and political involvement can be seen in the struggle to endorse and implement Project Equality, a nationally-directed but regionally-implemented interreligious program designed to use the purchasing power of religious institutions in ways that seek to advance equal employment opportunities. Reuss strongly argued against participation in the program because it involved the church in supporting an implied boycott of business firms.[1] He also feared that church members would reduce their contributions as a result of the program. At the strong urging of President Schiotz, however, the Commission endorsed Project Equality and recommended all levels of the church to participate in its effort. The program was subsequently endorsed by the 1968 General Convention.[2] But while the departments of the ALC are committed to equal employment opportunities, the ALC still has not implemented the program in its purchase of goods and services.[3]

---

ministers under Social Security ("Social Security Coverage for Ministers" [1966]), retention of exemption for military service for divinity students ("Exemption from Military Service for Divinity Students" [1968]), use of institutional identification by ministers in the endorsement of political candidates ("Institutional Identification in Political Endorsements" [1968]), and the role of the church in community organization (Minutes of the Church Council, June 14-16, 1968, pp. 47-48).

[1] "Report of the Executive Director to the Commission on Research and Social Action" for meeting on February 16-17, 1968, Appendix D.

[2] Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 471-73.

[3] The Board of Trustees, which supervises such purchases for the national offices through its Service Section, has not implemented the program even though it was endorsed by the

The Struggle for Political Effectiveness

There have been many times since the merger when the ALC has struggled with the question of its political effectiveness. At one of the first meetings of the Commission on Research and Social Action, President Schiotz suggested that the adequacy of influencing legislation primarily through the voice of individual members needed to be reexamined.[1] Reuss, who has strongly defended the avenue of individual member action, has asked: "Has the time come that we need to think more consciously about the goals of public policy and seek as a corporate body, in articulate and effective ways, to influence the direction in which public policy should move?"[2] Beyond

---

General Convention. George Schultz, executive secretary for the Board, indicated in an interview on July 24, 1969, that he was not sympathetic to the project even though he was in full agreement with equal employment opportunity. Augsburg Publishing House, on the other hand, adopted Project Equality in February, 1968, and has cooperated with Project Equality of Minnesota in modifying a number of business and employment practices. Interview with Albert Anderson, assistant general manager of Augsburg Publishing House, July 18, 1969.

1. Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, February 27-28, 1961, p. 4.

2. "Looking Ahead in Social Action," prepared by Reuss for Commission consultation with district committee representatives, January, 1966, p. 5. The closest the Commission has come to suggesting that the corporate church should speak for its members was in its publication of the study booklet, Bases for Lutheran Social Action, written by Kenneth Alpers in 1965. Alpers stated: "There come times when the church must speak, not only to its members but also for them to the world. And if it relegates such times only to unusual crises which endanger the corporate church, it cannot complain if the world hints at

raising questions, however, the ALC has not yet developed any different approaches to political involvement.

The current effort to restructure the ALC gives no evidence of effecting any changes in this direction.[1] An effort to conduct a dialogue in the ALC on a number of questions, including its political role, was sidetracked by the Commission in late 1968 after having been approved by the Church Council.[2] The Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. is currently examining the role of the church in the changing social order, but its discussions receive little attention among the ALC membership.

---

its hypocrisy." P. 31. While the Commission did not endorse the document as its own views, the booklet has received extensive circulation through the church.

[1] In 1965 the Joint Council established a committee to evaluate "the relativity of the various aspects of the church's work in an effort to develop a long range study in the light of the changing social order." Minutes of the Joint Council, July 1, 1965, p. 12. The 1966 General Convention focused the concerns of the committee on problems of operations structure (cf. Reports and Actions, 1968, p. 706). Since then most of the efforts of the Long Range Study Committee have concerned the restructuring of the ALC. Cf. Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 704-31.

[2] The Commission requested Church Council approval for a conference on task and priorities of the ALC in February, 1968. The intent of the conference was to convene a cross-section of ALC members, including women and youth along with staff executive and board representatives, in order to reexamine the work of the ALC in the context of current needs. The Church Council authorized the conference, but the Commission in December, 1968, cancelled plans for the meeting under the pretext that the reexamination was already taking place in other committees of the church. Some of the interviewed persons interpreted the action of the Commission as an effort on the part of some officials to prevent the possibility that new directions in the church's program, perhaps unacceptable to some ALC leaders, might result, including a re-thinking of the ALC's position on political action.

The Commission on Research and Social Action has frequently been criticized for restricting its activity to social analysis and the preparation of study materials and social policy statements. Critics emphasize the misleading character of the words "research" and "social action."[1] The Commission has several times considered changing its name, but it has never actually instituted the process for constitutional change.[2] Reuss realizes the confusion caused by the title, but defends the Commission, insisting it is simply following its constitutional mandate. It is debatable, however, whether the Commission has exhausted the possibilities inherent within its present outline of responsibilities.[3]

---

[1] Many persons have indicated that "social action" in the Commission's name means that the Commission should engage in action projects designed to seek social justice. The Church Council's authorization to the Commission, however, and the Commission's stance has been more limited. The Commission seeks to encourage members of the ALC to engage in social action. "Research" was added to the name at the time of the merger to legitimize the propriety of the church undertaking research projects. However, the Church Council has never funded this dimension of the Commission's responsibility. Thus the Commission, strictly speaking, neither engages in research nor social action. One delegate to the 1969 Conference on Inner City Ministries moved, in frustration, that the Commission be renamed the Commission on Social Research. The "Report of the Long Range Study Committee" to the 1968 General Convention proposed a Board of Research, Analysis and Long Range Planning. Cf. Reports and Actions, 1968, p. 724.

[2] "Report of the Executive Director to the Commission on Research and Social Action" for meeting on March 23, 1962, p. 5; Minutes of the Commission, March 23, 1962, p. 4, and March 8-9, 1963, p. 7. In addition the matter has been discussed at least twice in Commission meetings in the past two years.

[3] "Policies and Procedures to Guide the Commission on Research and Social Action of The ALC," approved by the Church Council on October 27, 1961, and revised on June 27, 1964,

XUM

There have been a number of attempts to create within the ALC national offices a structure to deal more adequately with political and social challenges. ALC participation in the national civil rights efforts early in the 1960's was on an ad hoc basis centered in the office of the president. Following the Selma-Montgomery March in 1965 a proposal was presented to the president urging that he appoint an administrative assistant with assigned responsibility for more effective ALC involvement in national efforts to further the cause of social justice.[1] But Schiotz continued to respond to events on an ad hoc basis.

The challenge of the national crisis in 1968 again brought the question to a head in the ALC. In the spring of that year the president, at the urging of the Church Council, did appoint a special assistant for a period of one year to

---

indicates rather broad opportunities for the Commission. Within its current guidelines, the Commission has adequate authority to provide staff services to stimulate, plan, and conduct pilot projects and action models throughout the church; to utilize approaches to social education such as seminars, workshops, and conference for planning action strategies, in addition to policy statements and studies; to increase joint planning and action with other national offices through reexamination of priorities and cooperative ventures; to issue Commission-adopted positions on various social problems addressed to (not for!) the ALC in order to stimulate thinking and promote discussion; and to involve ALC members knowledgeable in social, economic, and political problems in the work of the Commission, including the formulation of policy statements and study documents, allowing the Commission staff to serve as coordinators of the Commission's activities.

[1] Leadership in the proposal was given by Charles Lutz, then editor of the youth publication, ONE. Interview with W. Herbert Kent on July 15, 1969.

coordinate the ALC response to the crisis. In anticipating the end of the special assistant's term, the Commission on Research and Social Action led in an attempt to have responsibility for social justice lodged with one of the operating departments of the church or, at least, assigned to a permanent presidential assistant with responsibility to coordinate the departmental efforts. Due to many factors, including interdepartmental rivalry and lack of commitment to corporate ALC involvement in the quest for social justice by some persons, responsibility was finally given to a coordinating committee of departmental directors. During the discussions leading to the establishment of the coordinating committee, the Church Council again indicated its desire that the Commission on Research and Social Action remain a department for social analysis without program responsibilities.[1] To this date, the ALC still has not assigned specific responsibility for the concerns of social justice.[2]

The need for such a department remains, as became clear in the summer of 1969. In the spring of 1968 the ALC inner city congregations organized to challenge the church with their particular problems. The Conference of Inner City Clergy and Laity called for corporate ALC action in a number of areas,

---

1. "Report of the Executive Director to the Commission on Research and Social Action" for meeting on October 14-15, 1968, pp. 1-2.

2. Cf. Chapter 7, p. 233ff, for specific attempts in 1968 to assign such responsibility.

XUM

including improvement of inner-city educational and employment opportunities, support for open housing, efforts to aid in the elimination of poverty, action to increase health and welfare benefits coupled with reform of the present welfare system, and attempts to improve police-community relations.[1] The conference pleaded for ALC efforts, including legislative activity, to help alleviate the crisis in the nation. An evaluation of ALC efforts presented at the 1969 Conference of Inner City Ministries showed that the ALC national offices had either been unable or unwilling to move in this direction.[2]

Another struggle for increased political effectiveness is the current process of redefining the task of the district committees of research and social action. At the time of the merger the committees had been established primarily as reaction panels to examine study materials and proposed policy statements prepared by the Commission on Research and Social Action. However, the committees increasingly devoted more of their attention to social problems and issues within their respective districts. By 1967, for example, many district committees were directing the majority of their time to the study of district problems, participating in action projects in the district, and occasionally preparing resolutions on current state legislative

---

[1] Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 247-66.

[2] "Report on Actions of ALC Divisions, Departments, and Commissions in Response to Referrals By Omaha Convention of 1968 CICM Resolutions," prepared June 21, 1969 by Leonard Klippen.

XUM

issues. The Commission approved a restatement of the functions of the district committees in 1969, based upon the then current activities of the committees.[1] The Church Council, however, directed that the district functions be reformulated with the view to restricting their right to engage in action projects and political activity.[2] At the insistence of President Schiotz, the Commission acceded to the Church Council's directive.[3]

The Present Quandary of the ALC

Today the ALC is in a quandary with respect to its political role. It continues to operate on the basis of a cautious and restricted approach to political involvement. At the same time it is unable to respond adequately to many current challenges. A number of factors are responsible for this predicament. Together these factors serve to reenforce the present political role of the church.

In the first place the ALC is organized to deal with the tasks which the church considered important two decades ago. This is not to suggest that all or even a majority of the leaders and members find the present structure inadequate. It simply indicates that the present institutional framework of the ALC, including its budgetary allocations, had its origin in the immediate post-World War II period. At that time major attention was devoted to the establishment of new congregations, the continuation of world missions, supervision and consolidation of the church's colleges and social service agencies, and providing parish education materials. The church was just beginning to recognize its responsibility for social concerns beyond traditional social welfare activities.

---

[1] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, April 18-19, 1969, p. 2 and Appendix A.

[2] Minutes of the Church Council, June 23-25, 1969, p. 31; cf. "Report of the Executive Director to the Commission on Research and Social Action" for meeting on September 12-13, 1969, pp. 2-3.

[3] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, September 12-13, 1969, pp. 2-3.

Now the church is faced with a shifting range of challenges. The realities of racism and poverty, the inadequacies of social welfare, the urgent needs of mission in the inner city, the almost impossible financial burden of unilateral parish education programs, the apparent irrelevance of traditional church programs for many members all test the present ALC structure beyond its capacity to respond. Ad hoc coordinating committees and public relations efforts merely evade the need to find structural avenues for serious attention to the new challenges. A considerable number of the challenges relate to concerns of social justice and political action. As indicated previously, neither the Commission on Research and Social Action nor the ALC as a whole is presently prepared seriously to engage these challenges in ways adequate to the need.[1]

Another factor in the quandary is the rural setting of the ALC. One-third of the ALC membership lives in Minnesota and Wisconsin,[1] and if Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan are added, 69% live in eight North Central states. An additional 13% live in California, Texas, and Washington. The ALC therefore is basically an upper midwestern church. At the same time approximately 62% of total baptized ALC members live outside the nation's standard metropolitan statistical areas.[2] This indicates that a sizable portion of the ALC members are not personally and directly acquainted with urban ills and the pressing need for social justice in the country. The closest experience many of them have is via the mass media. Thus the ALC is not confronted with current needs in the same way that a more urban-oriented church would be.

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 7.

The organization of the inner city interests within the ALC in 1968 at the Conference on Inner City Clergy and Laity signals the beginning of an effort to force greater ALC response to urban problems. As a result of the group's efforts the agenda of the 1968 General Convention was shifted to allow for six hours of consideration to current social problems. The Committee of Inner City Ministries also controls majority membership on the Advisory Council to the Coordinating Committee on

---

[1] "Some Facts About the States Where Congregations of the ALC Minister," compiled by Carl Reuss in July, 1962.

[2] "American Missions Together," prepared by the Division of American Missions of the National Lutheran Council, June, 1962, p. 2. In comparison with the 38% of ALC members who live in standard metropolitan statistical areas, the corresponding figures for the Lutheran Church in America is 65%. Fifty-five percent of all Lutheran live in such areas.

XUM

National Crises, established at the 1968 General Convention to coordinate the ALC response to the national crisis. The Advisory Council was primarily responsible for the allocation of the major portion of ALC crisis funds to inner city needs rather than to additional projects supervised by the national church body. The inner city and minority members of the ALC are beginning to exert themselves.

A third factor in the quandary is the ALC's understanding of its mission. Stated most sharply, the mission of the church for many members is the salvation of souls and not the reform of society.[1] Government and not the church is responsible for order and justice in society. It is contended that the purpose of the church is to preach the Gospel so as to convert men to a new basis of life. Civic activities and political action are viewed as the fruit of transformed lives. Accordingly the political role of the church is to educate and to guide members to express the life of faith in socially useful ways. The approach of the ALC to social involvement has generally been to equip its members more effectively to relate to and participate as Christians in the social, political, and economic areas of life. To this end it has tried to analyze and study social problems, raise ethical questions, and discuss various implications of the Christian faith in respect to particular issues.

---

[1] Lawrence Kersten, op. cit., claims that laymen support the official ALC stance while a majority of ministers favor more direct ALC involvement. He found for example, with respect to race relations, that 19% of the laity and 4% of the ministers believed the church should respond only in sermons and/or study groups; 45% of the laity and 30% of the ministers believed that individuals should work actively for civil rights on their own outside the church, but the church should not involve itself directly as a group; and 35% of the laity and 67% of the clergy believe that both individuals and church organizations should work actively for the civil rights of all races, even if this means peaceful picketing and demonstrations. P. 274. There is no reason to suppose that the above responses are not reflective of the individual vs. corporate action stance on other questions. Kersten also found that 43% of the ALC laity and 87% of the ministers agreed or probably agreed that the church should issue policy statements on social and economic matters, and that 22% of the laity and 57% of the clergy agreed or probably agreed that church leaders as a group should take a public stand on political issues. P. 262. He also found that only 10% of the laity and 30% of the ministers disagree or probably disagree that "the church can best contribute to the solution of social problems by preaching the Gospel and by winning individuals to salvation." P. 262. In his survey 28% of the laity and 43% of the clergy disagreed or probably disagreed that "the most important thing is the salvation of mankind to eternal life rather than carrying on a social reform program here in this world." P. 262. Sixty-seven percent of the laity and 35% of the clergy agreed or probably agreed that "the primary responsibility of

This approach has considered the task of the church as one of equipping the laity for their ministry in the world. It encourages the formation of new channels and forms of ministry in the world. It encourages the formation of new channels and forms of ministry through which Christians can work cooperatively in the community outside of church agencies, and helps create a climate of opinion in which public policy can be debated more openly and honestly. Convention resolutions and study materials are primarily directed at assisting and encouraging lay members of the church to practice civic righteousness in their individual capacities within the institutions of

---

the local congregation is to serve the needs of the membership before serving the needs of those outside the church." P. 275.

XUM

society. Direct, corporate activity upon other groups and institutions in society has generally been viewed cautiously as a means of action. This position is subscribed to by a number of the ALC leaders and is generally expressed in the policy statements of the Commission on Research and Society Action and the church.

However, many persons within the ALC, including some of the leaders, are challenging this traditional position. One former executive claims that the traditional stance is only half the Gospel.[1] He and others contend that an individual-oriented moral influence approach is insufficient and that more attention must be given to the corporate role of the church in reforming the institutions and structures of society. They recognize the role of individual Christians in this work, but also urge that the church develop corporate responses to the challenges of economic and social justice.

The traditional ALC stance interprets Luther's teaching on the "two kingdoms" sociologically rather than theologically and eschatologically.[2] The ALC position seeks to carve out clearly delineated spheres of activity for the church vis-a-vis the other institutions in society. It is problematic today, however, whether the diffused multiplicity of interacting social institutions, including the church, allows for such a sharp

---

1. L. David Brown, former executive director of the Division of Youth Activity, in "Half Gospels or Whole?," mimeographed paper.

2. Cf. Chapter 3, p. 56f.

dichotomy between church and society, especially with the emphasis on government as a process rather than a static institution. Lutherans in this country also are increasingly recognizing that the relationship of church and government is one of "institutional separation and functional interaction" rather than a "wall of separation," a position also supported by the ALC.

There is increasing awareness by the mainline Protestant churches that both personal regeneration and social transformation are tasks of the church. Concern for the wholeness of man-in-community rejects a one-sided religious and social individualism. The church is concerned with redeeming corporate and institutional life as well as individuals. Its focus is the redeemed society including the patterns and relationships in life which promote or hinder life together as well as the personal orientation of persons. Corporate political involvement in the struggle for social justice is increasingly being seen as an integral part of the church's work.

This latter perspective, however, does not generally inform the direction of the ALC today. In its documents and in its actions it tends to remain faithful to the position that political action is a result rather than an integral part of the church's work, and that individuals rather than the corporate church are the proper instruments for political participation. While this stance is increasingly being subjected to criticism it still supports the cautious political role of the ALC.

The quandary with respect to the ALC's understanding of its work relates very closely to a fourth factor shaping the ALC's political role, namely, the reluctance of many ALC leaders to use corporate power to effect social and political change. This reluctance is expressed not only by those who deny social responsibility on the part of the church, but also by many who affirm such responsibility. Many believe with the Commission on Research and Social Action that the "church loses its unique character when it enters the arena of politics and economics as one among many power blocs, pressure groups, and special interests."[1] The same attitude was expressed in opposition to ALC endorsement of Project Equality.[2] Inherent in this position is the belief that when the church avoids conscious use of its corporate power, its corporate power remains unused and therefore neutral in the struggle for social justice.

The church as a social institution, however, has the capacity to influence change in society. The claim to moral neutrality and disavowal of power is an illusion; it only serves to sanctify the status quo. Refusal to exercise corporate power in the interests of the church's concerns in society is itself corporate action with the church defending the values and patterns already prevailing in society. The proper consideration for an institution is not whether but how it will exercise its power. The desire to escape from conscious and responsible

---

1. "A Hard Look at Our Task."

2. Cf. Chapter 5, p. 152.

exercise of corporate power on the part of the ALC violates one of the church's seven principles of involvement: "Resist any and every effort which would make the church captive of a particular class, political, economic, racial, national, or ideological interest, keeping itself free to proclaim that counsel and bear that witness which it believes its Lord expects of His church."[1] The fear of becoming another "pressure group" inhibits the ALC from supporting politically those moral values which it expresses. This fear tends to subject the ALC to the very interests which it seeks to avoid.

The denial of institutional power on the part of the church ignores the realities of political action and social change. As indicated in Chapter II, public policy is the result of a process in which a multitude of interests compete for recognition. Any institution which withdraws from the contest or limits its actions to the formulating and articulating stages of the policy making process greatly reduces the possibility of influencing the policy which is finally adopted. If the church is genuinely committed to help create a more just society, it must consciously and intelligently use its political power in support of those interests and measures which it believes move in the direction of a more just society. It must not deny itself the very means by which it can accomplish its goals in a relevant and effective manner. An exhortation to individual members to participate in the political process is

---

1. "Our Approach to Social Involvement."

XUM

commendable, but the major participants in the quest for power are institutional forces. The avenues for corporate social and political involvement contained in the social policy statement, "Our Approach to Social Involvement," point the way toward more responsible corporate action.[1] To date, however, many of those approaches are in advance of the actual ALC experience. Many of the ALC's executives, however, seem to be ready for increased political action on the part of the church.[2]

The above factors help explain the present quandary with respect to the ALC's political role. The absence of assigned responsibility for social justice and corporate political involvement, the rural orientation of the membership, an understanding of the church's task that excludes social justice as a primary purpose of the church, and the suspicion of corporate power reenforce the present restricted level of political activity which the ALC defines as its proper role. As the ALC moves toward a transformationist attitude toward its social responsibility, its activity shows it to be in the "social education" phase of Protestant social consciousness in this country. Its thought and action indicate that the ALC restricts its activity to the first and second stages of the policy-making process, the formulation and articulation of public issues. As a result, its efforts to influence public policy reflect a low degree of political realism.

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 5, p. 139.

[2] Only a few interviewed ALC leaders expressed the view that the church should rely solely upon individual members to press for political action. Most of the leaders indicated that the church should be free to take any action which it considers necessary in a given situation. The majority of ALC leaders emphasized the need for competent leadership to guide the church in the area of political action, the importance of a deliberative process for deciding church positions, and the helpfulness of theologically-grounded principles to guide broad policy objectives. As long as these considerations were present, most interviewed leaders were not too concerned about the particular communication methods which might be used in political action.

Chapter VI

SOCIAL CONCERNS AND PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES IN THE ALC

During the decade of the sixties, the ALC's major concerns related to the founding of congregations in new population centers, support for its social service agencies, educational institutions, and world mission program, and preparation of parish education materials. Under the leadership of the Commission on Research and Social Action, the church adopted a limited political role but engaged in little direct political activity. Most of the Commission's efforts were indirect and focused on the development of study materials and policy statements on social, economic, and political issues.

The ALC, however, has not been unaware of the fundamental problems in American society. The Commission on Research and Social Action, the Church Council, the president of the church, and the Division of Youth Activity devoted considerable attention to the social concerns of the period. Although not focusing on specific social issues, the Division of College Education through the work of Loren Halvorson also helped direct the ALC to more serious engagement with the

XUM

issues and problems of society.[1] The Lutheran Standard, official ALC publication, and Event, produced by the men's auxiliary, also considered numerous problems.

A number of questions were treated by the National Lutheran Council and its successor, the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., on behalf of the member Lutheran churches. In many instances, the ALC did not duplicate the inter-Lutheran efforts, but allowed the National Lutheran Council and the Lutheran Council to speak and act on its behalf. The National Lutheran Council worked for revision of immigration laws, supported foreign aid appropriations and civil rights legislation, and opposed federal aid for religious elementary and secondary educational institutions.[2] Since the formation of the Lutheran Council in 1967 the inter-Lutheran agency has publicly supported an expansion of educational television, increased appropriations for foreign aid, amendment of proposed tax reform legislation, and reform of the welfare system.[3] In addition

---

[1] The involvement of other ALC departments in contemporary issues and problems is considered in the next chapter.

[2] Interview with Robert Van Deusen, October 28, 1969. Cf. Frederick Wentz, Lutherans in Concert, op. cit., pp. 180ff. Some of the official statements and studies of the National Lutheran Council also are listed in The Church's Speak: A Bibliography of Official Statements and Study Reports by Henry J. Whiting (New York: Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., 1969). However, the bibliography does not contain all of the ALC social policy statements.

[3] Robert Van Deusen related in the interview on October 28, 1969, that the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. has given congressional testimony on a number of issues. He appeared before the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Commerce Committee

XUM

the Lutheran Council is currently involved in a study of the role of the church in American society.

The Commission on Research and Social Action

The Commission on Research and Social Action has considered many public issues since 1961. As noted in the last chapter, most of the Commission's efforts have been in the preparation of study materials and policy statements on social, economic, and political problems. The early part of the decade was devoted to gaining an acceptance within the ALC for the propriety of considering such questions. For this reason, one of the Commission's first acts was to circulate a number of social policy statements and studies prepared by the Board for Christian Social Action of the former American Lutheran Church.[1]

---

on April 28, 1967, in support of an expansion of educational television. Increased foreign aid appropriations were supported by C. Thomas Spitz, Jr., General Secretary of the Lutheran Council, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 29, 1968, and by Van Deusen before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 14, 1968. Testimony on the proposed tax reform measure was given to the House Ways and Means Committee on April 10, 1969, and to the Senate Finance Committee on September 15, 1969. Testimony on the proposed welfare reform legislation was given to the House Ways and Means Committee on November 4, 1969.

[1] The Commission on Research and Social Action circulated The Christian in His Social Living, a compilation of policy statements of the former American Lutheran Church, along with "A Christian Approach to the Alcoholic Beverage Question," "The Church Looks at Immorality in Print and on Screen," and "Your Congregation and Disaster Preparedness" in the new church. Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action," February 27-28, 1961, p. 6.

By 1964 and certainly by 1966 the work of the Commission was generally well received throughout the church.[1]

The subject of Communism was the first major issue considered by the Commission, and it received the largest portion of the Commission's time in 1961. Communism's Challenge to America and American Churches, prepared by Reuss, was the subject of the first study report. By the spring of 1962 the Commission had received requests for over 50,000 copies of the booklet.[2] The Commission also adopted and referred to the Church Council for its consideration, a proposed policy statement on Communism.[3] Frederick Schwarz discussed the work of his Christian Anti-Communism Crusade with the Commission in December, 1961. While the Commission recommended that Lutheran churches study the subject of Communism, it carefully refrained from endorsing the work of Schwarz' organization.[4] The Commission also authorized the reprinting of a series of articles on Communism which had appeared in The Lutheran Standard.[1]

---

[1] Carl Reuss indicated in an interview on July 9, 1969, that the Commission on Research and Social Action is not "considerably accepted" in the ALC, although still reaching only a minority of laity and probably of pastors. He also expressed the view that the close contact with the district committees and the incorporation of review comments into the finished drafts helped win acceptance in the ALC.

[2] "Report of the Commission on Research and Social Action," Reports and Actions, 1962, p. 358. Since that time an additional 55,000 copies have been circulated. Information provided by the Service Section, October 21, 1969.

[3] Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Commission on Research and Social Action, September 14, 1961, p. 4.

[4] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, December 8-9, 1961, pp. 5-6.

Marriage and family life, including the problem of abortion, was another area of early Commission interest. It was in this area that Reuss had provided creative leadership in American Lutheranism during the 1950's.[2] In late 1961 the Commission adopted a revised statement on marriage and divorce, based on the position of the former American Lutheran Church.[3] The statement was approved at the 1964 General Convention.[4]

In the fall of 1962 the Commission sponsored a consultation on issues in medical ethics which established the need for church guidance especially on the issues of abortion, sterilization, and the artificial prolonging of human life.[5] Out of the impetus of the conference came a Commission statement allowing for voluntary sterilization after adequate spiritual counselling.[6] In 1965 the Commission gave renewed attention to the problem of birth control, redrafting a statement from the former American Lutheran Church taking into consideration recent development in the areas of marriage, the role of sex in marriage, and population control.[1] The proposed policy statement, "Responsible Reproduction," was circulated throughout the church in 1966-67. A proposed statement calling for the liberalization of abortion laws followed in 1969.[2] The Commission also produced a number of study reports in the area of family life.

---

[1] Reprinted as How to Understand Communism. The articles had appeared in the August 1, 15, and 29, and September 12, 1961, issues of The Lutheran Standard.

[2] Cf. Chapter 4, p. 120.

[3] "Toward an Understanding on Marriage, Divorce, and Consistent Pastoral Practice," Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, December 8-9, 1961, pp. 2, 7.

[4] "Teachings and Practice on Marriage and Divorce" (1964).

[5] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, September 22, 1962, p. 2.

[6] "Pastoral Counsel Concerning Voluntary Sterilization" (1963).

Questions of church-state relations were before the Commission from late 1962 through 1964. In 1962 the Commission upheld the Supreme Court's rejection of religious oaths as a qualification for public office[3] and responded favorably to the Court's school prayer decision.[4] In response to the 1962 General Convention request for a comprehensive statement on church-state relations, the Commission formulated "Church-State Relations in the U.S.A.,"[5] received at the 1964 General

---

[1] The statement, "Responsible Reproduction," was a redraft of a statement of the former American Lutheran Church entitled "Responsible Parenthood."

[2] "Abortion and the Law" (1969).

[3] The case was Torcaso v. Watkins, 367 U.S. 488 (1961); Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, March 23, 1962, pp. 5-6. The men's auxiliary of the church had attempted to get ALC opposition to the decision. Cf. "Report of the Executive Director to the Commission on Research and Social Action" for meeting on March 23, 1962, p. 8.

[4] Case of Engel et al. v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421 (1962); Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, September 22, 1962, p. 3. The Iowa district at its spring convention had requested church opposition to the decision.

[5] "An American Lutheran Position on Church-State Relations in the U.S.A." Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, April 17, 1964, p. 2.

XUM

Convention and formally adopted in 1966. The Commission also prepared a statement on Sunday closing laws for the 1964 General Convention.[1]

In the area of race relations the Commission in 1961 recommended that the ALC endorse the statement, "A Christian Affirmation on Human Relations," which had been previously adopted by the three merging churches.[2] In 1963 it released a study, A Congregational Guide for Human Relations,[3] and adopted a statement which set forth ALC policy with respect to ministry in interracial communities.[4] The statement was formulated in cooperation with the Division of American Missions. The Commission also endorsed the work of the Lutheran Human Relations Association of America, an inter-Lutheran interracial program.[5] In 1966 Reuss and the chairman of the Commission, W. A. Poovey, gave leadership at the General Convention in the formulation of a statement which defined equal opportunity as a civil right.[6]

---

[1] "Sunday Closing Laws." Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, December 9-10, 1963, p. 5.

[2] Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Commission on Research and Social Action, September 14, 1961, p. 4.

[3] The booklet was written by Robert Graetz.

[4] "Effective Ministry in Intercultural Communities." Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, December 9-10, 1963, p. 5.

[5] "Endorsement of the Lutheran Human Relations Association of America." (1964)

[6] "Equality of Opportunity--A Civil Right." Cf. "Director's Report on Third General Convention Action Relevant to Work of Commission on Research and Social Action," Appendix B in "Report of Executive Director to Commission on Research and Social Action" for meeting on December 5-6, 1966.

XUM

At the 1968 General Convention Commission statements on Project Equality,[1] interracial marriage,[2] and the ALC response to the national crisis[3] were adopted. The Commission also circulated a study on white racism and black power in 1968.[4]

War and peace was another subject receiving Commission attention. In 1962 the Commission had received a request from the Church Council to prepare a comprehensive statement on the church's attitude toward war and peace, including the question of conscientious objection.[5] After a number of basic revisions in the text, the statement, "War, Peace, and Freedom," was approved by the 1966 General Convention.[6] A Commission policy statement which called upon the ALC to seek inclusion in the Selective Service Act of the right to object to participation in a particular war was defeated at the 1968 General Convention.[7] The same question along with a call for expanded opportunities for non-military forms of national service and major reform of the Selective Service Act is included in a proposed statement which will be considered at the 1970 General Convention.[1] The Commission also assisted in the preparation of social policy statements on the subject of the war in Vietnam for the 1966 and 1968 General Convention.[2]

---

[1] "Project Equality."

[2] "Interracial Marriage."

[3] "Decision in a Time of National Crisis."

[4] The study, "White Racism and Black Power," was printed along with a proposed policy statement on dissent and civil disobedience under the title, "Racism, Power, and Authority."

[5] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, September 22, 1962, p. 4.

[6] The proposed statement, "Issues of War and Peace," which the Commission had submitted to the 1964 General Convention was referred back to the Commission for revision. Reports and Actions, 1964, pp. 449-56.

[7] Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 484-88.

Other Commission studies relating to public issues concerned dissent and civil disobedience,[3] home rule for the District of Columbia,[4] American ratification of the United Nations human rights covenants,[5] traffic safety,[6] world hunger,[7] rural economic problems,[8] violence in television programming,[9] capital punishment,[10] the California grape strike,[11] and federal tax reform, including taxation of church properties.[1] Only limited attention was given to the war on poverty[2] and the subject of unemployment.[3]

---

[1] The Commission will consider the draft of a proposed statement, "National Service and Selective Service Reform," prepared by this writer, in April, 1970.

[2] "Director's Report on Third General Convention Actions Relevant to Work of Commission on Research and Social Action," Appendix B of "Report of Executive Director to Commission on Research and Social Action" for meeting on December 5-6, 1966; "Vietnam 1968" (1968).

[3] "Authority, Dissent, and Civil Disobedience" (1969).

[4] "Home Rule for the District of Columbia" (1967).

[5] "U. S. Ratification of Human Rights Covenants" (1967).

[6] "Traffic Safety" (1968).

[7] "Hunger in the World" (1968).

[8] "Rural Economic Problems" (1969) and "Bargaining Power for Farmers" (1969). These two proposed statements have been printed under the title, "Economic Problems of Rural America."

[9] "Violence in Television Programming" (1969). This statement was prepared in cooperation with the Commission on Public Communication.

[10] "The Death Penalty" (1969).

[11] "The Grape Controversy" (1969).

In addition to the above studies the Commission focused attention upon a number of social questions in consultations it held with representatives of the district committees on research and social action. In the fall of 1963 such a consultation in Washington, D. C., considered topics of church-state relations, tax policies and the church, moral issues in modern war, arms control and disarmament, race relations, censorship, public service, and the pastor's role in social action.[4] A number of the addresses were reprinted in paperback form and circulated in the church.[5] Probable social issues in the 1970's were discussed in December of 1966,[6] and a consultation in May,

---

1. "Tax Reform: A Cause for Christian Action" (1969).

2. The Commission published two issues of Viewpoint devoted to poverty. "The War on Poverty," written by Carl Reuss and Edwin Olson, was issued in June, 1964, and "Congregations, Communities, and the 'War on Poverty'," written by Reuss, was printed in March, 1965.

3. "Unemployment" written by Carl Reuss and Miss Lee Kasberg, was issued in Viewpoint in December, 1964.

4. "Program for Consultation," attached to Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, October 3, 1963.

5. About 5,000 copies of the paperback, How Complex Are Our Issues!, were circulated in the church.

6. "Meeting of Research and Social Action With District Committee Representatives," December 5-6, 1966, Appendix B in Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, December 5-6, 1966.

1968, considered the urban crisis.[1] Questions of the church and public policy were examined in January, 1969.[2] The most recent consultation, January, 1970, focused on social welfare reform.[3]

Church Council, Joint Council and General Conventions

In addition to receiving social statements from the Commission on Research and Social Action, the Church Council has an independent role in the consideration of social issues. Constitutionally the Church Council is responsible for approving any social policy statements issued for the guidance of church members or for transmittal to public agencies.[4] Except for the General Conventions, the Church Council is the official spokesman for the ALC to the general public on public policy matters. It has considered a number of social issues in addition to those referred to it by the Commission.

While the Church Council is responsible for approving official policy statements, until recently statements which were to be considered by the General Convention were transmitted through the Joint Council.[1] Thus the Joint Council, composed of the members of the Church Counci- plus the members of the Board of Trustees, also has recorded its judgment on social policy questions. The Joint Council has initiated no social policy statements of its own, although it has passed judgment on a few social questions which have not received prior consideration from the Church Council. In this study the latter questions are indicated along with the description of issues considered by the Church Council.

---

[1] "Record of Proceedings, Conference on 'Toward a Perspective on the Urban Crisis'," Appendix A in Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, May 2-4, 1968.

[2] "Record of Proceedings, Workshop in Research and Social Action," January 9-11, 1969, Appendix A to Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, January 9-11, 1969.

[3] "Record of Proceedings, Consultation of Commission on Research and Social Action With Representatives of District Social Action Committees and District Social Service Committee Chairmen," January 8-10, 1970, Appendix A to Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, January 8, 1970.

[4] Cf. Chapter 5, pp. 127-28.

One of the first questions considered by the Church Council concerned the role of the church in society, specifically the place of the National Lutheran Council in seeking and/or voicing a Lutheran consensus on public issues. However, the question was permanently tabled due to the anticipated reorganization of the inter-Lutheran agency.[2] The propriety of the church engaging in social concerns was endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Church Council when it called for a continuance of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs in the World Council of Churches[3] and by the Church Council itself when it encouraged congregations to establish committees on social concerns.[1] In 1968 the Church Council called for a study of the church and community organization[2] and cautioned pastors to avoid the use of the name of their congregation or religious institution in the endorsement of political candidates.[3] The latter action stemmed from Kennedy and McCarthy endorsements in 1960 and 1968 by a number of Lutheran theological seminary professors.

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 1, footnote on p. 12.

[2] Minutes of the Church Council, August 3-6, 1960, p. 10, and February 7-9, 1961, p. 26. Interview with Arnold Michaelson, secretary of the ALC, August 7, 1969.

[3] Minutes of the Church Council, June 22-24, 26-27, 1967, p. 5.

On church-state questions the Church Council authorized the Division of World Missions to cooperate with the Peace Corps[4] and recommended General Convention adoption of a National Lutheran Council statement endorsing the national service organization.[5] In 1962 the Joint Council adopted a policy statement providing guidelines for the ALC in the use of federal aid to religious social and educational institutions.[6] Two years later the Joint Council opposed the compulsory attendance of cadets and midshipmen at religious services by adopting a resolution formulated by the National Lutheran Council.[1] In 1966 the Church Council supported the inclusion of ministers under the provisions of social security on a mandatory basis.[2] Finally in a recent action the Joint Council approved the purchase of chaplaincy services from the church by public agencies.[3]

---

[1] Minutes of the Church Council, June 22-24, 26-27, 1967, p. 43; "Social Concerns Committee in Model Constitution" (1968).

[2] Minutes of the Church Council, June 24-26, 1968, pp. 47-48.

[3] "Institutional Identification in Political Endorsements" (1968).

[4] "Peace Corps I" (1961).

[5] "Peace Corps II" (1962).

[6] "Federal Aid for Church Institutions." Minutes of the Joint Council, October 18, 1962, p. 87. In July the Church Council had appointed a special committee headed by Reuss to prepare the statement. Cf. Minutes of the Church Council, July 6-7, 9, 12, 1962, pp. 20-21.

Matters of race relations have been before the Church Council since its organization. Despite the request of the Church Council for a statement on interracial marriage in 1961, none was produced by the Commission on Research and Social Action until 1967.[4] In 1963 the Church Council adopted a resolution of the National Lutheran Council affirming an open membership policy in all congregations and calling upon the pastors to enforce the policy.[5] The position also promised financial support to any pastor who lost his pastorate for enforcing this stand. The following year it encouraged

---

1. "Compulsory Attendance at Worship Services at Military Academies." Minutes of the Joint Council, June 29-30, 1964, p. 68.

2. "Social Security Coverage for Ministers." Minutes of the Church Council, June 22-25, 1966, pp. 43-44. Action had been requested by the Board of Pensions.

3. "State Use of Chaplaincy Services." (1968). The Board of Social Service had requested clarification of the question.

4. Minutes of the Church Council, February 7-9, 1961, p. 29; October 23-27, 1961, p. 67; July 6-7, 9, 12, 1962, p. 21.

5. "Endorsement of Non-Discrimination in ALC Congregations" (1963).

congregations to promote interracial contacts in their communities[1] and included a provision for open church membership in the Model Constitution.[2] Since February, 1968, the Church Council has been especially concerned with the national crisis in race relations. At that time it acknowledged lack of adequate ALC response to minority problems and authorized the naming of a special assistant to the president to guide the action of the ALC in this area.[3] Later it endorsed the participation of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. in a national interreligious program on the national crisis.[4] In the summer of 1969 the Church Council rejected the demands of the "Black Manifesto," the challenge to the churches formulated by James Forman and the National Black Economic Development Conference, but directed that the Manifesto be mailed to the congregations and be studied as a symbol of frustration in the black community.[5] At the same time it pledged continued ALC priority to problems of social and economic justice.[6]

In other matters, the Church Council endorsed conscientious objection,[7] declined to seek a change in the

---

1. "Interracial Contacts" (1964).

2. "Open Membership clause in Model Constitution." The action amended Article VI(1) to read: "Membership shall be open without respect to race or color."

3. "The National Crisis and the ALC."

4. Minutes of the Church Council, June 24-26, 1968, p. 17.

5. "The Black Manifesto."

6. "Minority Issues."

7. "Conscientious Objection" (1963).

provisions allowing for exemption from military service for theological students,[1] endorsed a National Lutheran Council statement in 1961 cautioning against voter determination of support solely on the basis of religious faith,[2] issued a statement in support of therapeutic abortion[3] when the life or health of the mother was endangered, and opposed a contemplated legislative restriction reducing tax deductible contributions.[4] Of lesser importance it opposed the holding of national elections on the weekend,[5] favored a national religious census in 1966,[6] received a statement on Vietnam from the World Council of Churches in 1965,[7] and refused to act on a request from the Executive Committee of the South Pacific District asking the Church Council to protest the acceptance by Martin Niemoller, a German church leader, of the Lenin Peace Prize.[8]

The General Convention also considered a number of public issues. While many of these were referred to it by the Commission or the Church or Joint Councils, some originated at the biennial assemblies. The 1962 General Convention endorsed two such additional resolutions. The second Cuban crisis occurred when the convention was in session. Resolutions were adopted in support of President Kennedy's action with regard to Cuba and in opposition to the statement of the World Council of Churches which opposed the American naval blockade.[1] The 1964 General Convention adopted a statement in support of the Supreme Court's position regarding the exercise of prayer in the public schools.[2] At the 1966 General Convention statements on equality of opportunity as a civil right,[3] open housing,[4] and Vietnam[5] were adopted. The 1968 General Convention approved resolutions concerned with the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia,[6] international aid and development,[7] the Peace Corps,[8] citizen participation in the political process,[9] and repudiation of political candidates who appeal to racism.[10]

---

[1] "Exemption from Military Service for Divinity Students" (1968).

[2] "Religious Faith as a Factor in American Elections" (1961).

[3] "Therapeutic Abortion" (1963).

[4] "Income Tax Deductibility of Church Contributions" (1963).

[5] "Change of National Election Days" (1963).

[6] "Religious Census" (1963).

[7] Minutes of the Church Council, July 2-5, 1965, p. 34.

[8] Minutes of the Church Council, June 22-24, 26-27, 1967, pp. 58-59.

---

[1] "Support for President Kennedy in Cuban Crisis" and "Opposition to WCC Statement on Cuban Crisis."

[2] "Prayer in the Public Schools."

[3] "Equality of Opportunity--A Civil Right."

[4] "Open Housing."

[5] "Vietnam Involvement."

[6] "Czechoslovakia."

[7] "International Aid and Development."

[8] "Peace Corps III."

[9] "Citizen Participation in Election Process."

[10] "Racism and Political Candidates."

The President of the Church

Fredrik Schiotz, the president of the American Lutheran Church, has long been concerned about the church's responsibility for justice and involvement in social problems. He has strongly defended the right of the church to concern itself with such problems, although he tends to concentrate church action in statements rather than direct corporate action.[1] While most of his social concerns have been manifested in public statements both to members of the ALC and to the general public, he also has occasionally sanctioned official ALC participation in civil rights protests. It is generally acknowledged that his stands on many social questions are ahead of the positions held by the rank and file of ALC membership.

Schiotz's strongest social leadership has been in the area of civil rights and human relations. Nearly one-half of his columns relating to social concerns which have appeared in *The Lutheran Standard*, the official ALC publication, involved this subject. Three of his six pastoral letters on social issues also treated race relations.[1] In his address to the Constituting Convention of the church in 1960 he called for increased efforts to support open housing.[2] Following defeat of proposed fair-housing legislation in Minnesota in 1961, Schiotz organized a committee of local citizens to mobilize public opinion for the adoption of such legislation during the 1963 Minnesota legislative session, an effort which was successful.[3]

---

[1] This was made clear by President Schiotz in his negative response to the use of the boycott by church groups in support of the California grape strike. He said: "The church should sift facts, make them available to its people, and leave it to the conscience of its people to do what each may judge to be right. When the church becomes *primarily an action instrument*, it loses much of its power to teach, to prick the conscience, and ~~to~~ conciliate when this is in order." Schiotz, "Background of a Boycott," *The Lutheran Standard*, May 13, 1969, p. 14.

In 1963 the president focused the church's attention on the national civil rights efforts. In a pastoral letter to the congregations, he called upon the pastors to support the integration of public facilities and equal opportunity in housing and employment by addressing their members on the needs in the areas, by encouraging interracial community contacts, by maintaining open membership in the congregation, and by writing to senators and congressmen.[4] To support his call for action, Schiotz named five representatives to represent the ALC officially in the March on Washington.[5] In June of 1964 he again called upon church members to write their congressmen to support the proposed civil rights legislation in the House of Representatives.[1] In his address to the 1964 General Convention he emphasized that human beings had a higher priority in value than property and urged the delegates to help change the racial attitudes in their communities and to support fair-housing and equal opportunity in employment and education.[2] He warned that the "church in this generation may very well stand or fall by her proclamation and practice of righteousness in human relations.[3] After the convention, the president continued his call for open congregational membership and the need to change racial attitudes.[4]

---

[1] Pastor Letters of June 17, 1963; April 5, 1968; and July 11, 1969. Information from the office of the president.

[2] Interview with President Schiotz on October 10, 1969.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Pastoral Letter of June 17, 1963.

[5] President Schiotz stated his conviction that the march "may be a means to remind our representatives in Congress that it is still day; but night may come. This is the time to enact appropriate legislation for making civil rights a reality for

Schiotz also supported the Selma to Montgomery March, sending a personal representative to participate in the march.[5]

---

all those who do not know these rights in personal experience." "Five Named to Represent ALC in Civil Rights March," The Lutheran Standard, August 27, 1963, pp. 24-25.

[1] Fredrik Schiotz, "What Can Make 1964 a New Year?," The Lutheran Standard, January 14, 1964, p. 3.

[2] "Report of the President," Reports and Actions, 1964, pp. 76-88.

[3] Ibid., p. 87.

[4] "President's Column. . .," Commentator, April, 1965, pp. 6-7; Fredrik Schiotz, "What Mrs. Boyle Learned," The Lutheran Standard, November 2, 1965, p. 13; Schiotz, "Key to the Kerner Report," The Lutheran Standard, July 23, 1968, p. 21.

[5] After Selma, President Schiotz said: "The tragic events at Selma, Ala., have focused the nation's attention on the awful fact that many Americans continue to be deprived of their right to vote because of the color of their skin. When states' rights are used to frustrate citizen rights, it is time for the federal government to intervene. This intervention will be best

After the Watts disorders, he compared the plight of black Americans to the bondage of the Hebrew people in Egypt.[1] In the summer of 1966 the president called on ALC members to support the efforts of Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in order to avoid racial violence in the country.[2]

In February, 1968, Schiotz led the Church Council in a consideration of the responsibility of the ALC in the national crisis. He subsequently guided a church-wide emphasis which focused attention upon the need for white Americans to change their racial attitudes.[3] A major portion of his 1968 General Convention address was concerned with the task of the ALC in the light of the national racial crisis.[4] In the report he pointed to the sin of racism among church members, warned against backlash in the approaching national elections, and called upon the delegates to increase their efforts for social

---

accomplished through the enactment of proper legislation by the United States Congress." Quoted in "Lutherans Join in Demonstrations Against Racial Injustice," The Lutheran Standard, April 6, 1965, p. 5.

[1] Fredrik Schiotz, "Blind to the Things That Make for Peace," The Lutheran Standard, September 21, 1965, p. 12.

[2] President Schiotz acknowledged that his action was prompted by the fear of possible violence in the country. He noted that the response to King in Chicago might "very well determine whether those who seek change by peaceful means may continue to be the acknowledged leaders among Negro people or whether the following may shift to the advocates of black power." Quoted in "Schiotz Backs Efforts of Martin Luther King," The Lutheran Standard, August 23, 1966, p. 20.

[3] Cf. Chapter 7.

[4] "Report of the President," Reports and Actions, 1968, especially pp. 93-99.

XUM

and racial justice. In the summer of 1969 the president led the Church Council in adopting a moderate response to the Black Manifesto, urging that it be seen as "a relatively valid thermometer of the aches and frustrations of Black people . . . the upsurge of generations of pent-up feelings."[1]

Concerns of Communism and foreign policy issues also have received the attention of Schiotz. In his address to the 1962 district conventions he praised the Commission on Research and Social Action for its study report on Communism and defended the church against attacks from militant anti-Communist groups.[2] He also supported the membership of the Russian Orthodox Church in the World Council of Churches,[3] and urged the American government to present its concern for peace at neutral and even Communist-sponsored international conferences.[4] In other actions he protested the statement of the World Council of Churches on the American quarantine of Cuba[5] and applauded United Nations efforts in the field of human rights.[6]

Schiotz has reflected great uneasiness over the war in Vietnam. While rejecting pacifism as a personal stance and

---

[1] Pastoral Letter, July 11, 1969, p. 2.

[2] "Report of the President to District Conventions, 1961."

[3] "Report of the President," Reports and Actions, 1962, p. 78.

[4] "Dr. Schiotz Urges U. S. to Express Concern for Peace," The Lutheran Standard, September 12, 1961, pp. 8-9.

[5] "President's Column," Commentator, December 1962, p. 7.

[6] "President's Column," Commentator, June 1968, p. 4.

XUM

recognizing that military action is sometimes necessary in order to preserve peace, the president has serious reservations about American involvement in Southeast Asia. Indeed, unlike the 1966 and 1968 General Convention of the church which refused to petition the government to allow alternate service for selective conscientious objectors, he personally believes the Selective Service Act should be changed.[1] He also publicly supported the servicemen involved in the Presidio protest in San Franciso[2] and called for rejection of the ABM system.[3]

In another area, the president has exhibited concern about issues in church-state relations. He opposed federal aid to parochial schools, believing that it "would inevitably lead to deterioriation of the public school system."[1] In a letter to the pastors of the church, he requested that letters be sent to congressmen in support of the proposed Kennedy legislation to exclude such aid.[2] He also addressed the problem of federal aid to education in his message to the 1961 district conventions.[3] During the same year he encouraged pastors and laymen in Wisconsin to support legislative proposals for released time for religious education.[4] In 1963 he endorsed the Supreme Court's decision banning Bible reading and the use of the Lord's Prayer in the public schools,[5] and the following year testified before the House Judiciary Committee against proposed constitutional amendments to allow for the two practices.[6] He reaffirmed his opposition to the proposed amendments at the 1964 General Convention.[7]

---

[1] Fredrik Schiotz, "Vietnam Involvement," The Lutheran Standard, February 20, 1968, p. 13. Schiotz also prepared a twelve-page statement of his views on the war in Vietnam under the title, "Vietnam Statement," dated February 6, 1968.

In an address at St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minnesota, Schiotz claimed his position went beyond the one adopted by the 1966 General Convention in that the General Convention rejected a resolution that would have sanctioned selective objection. "Spiritual Scapegoat," The Lutheran Standard, April 16, 1968, pp. 28-29. However, in this Schiotz is mistaken. The 1966 General Convention approved the principle of selective conscientious objection in the statement, "War, Peace and Freedom," when it said in paragraph 14: "It is the Christian's duty therefore, as a loyal citizen to obey the demand of his government unless he feels conscience-bound to resist. . . . If he is sufficiently convinced that his nation is on a course hostile to God's will, the Christian has the right and the duty to resist." (Underscoring added.) What the General Convention refused to adopt was a resolution calling upon the Congress to provide alternative service to such selective objectors. Cf. Chapter 9, pp. 320-21.

[2] "Clergymen Issue Plea for Mutiny," Minneapolis Star, April 5, 1969, p. 16.

[3] Interview with President Schiotz, October 10, 1969.

---

[1] "Schiotz Hits Church-School Aid," The Lutheran Standard, April 25, 1961, p. 9.

[2] Pastoral Letter, March 21, 1961.

[3] "Report of the President to the District Conventions, 1961."

[4] "President's Column," Commentator, May 1961, p. 2.

[5] Pastoral Letter, June 17, 1963. The reference is to Abington School District v. Schempp, Murray v. Curlett, 374 U. S. 203 (1963).

[6] Fredrik Schiotz, "Don't Change the Constitution!," The Lutheran Standard, May 19, 1964, p. 6. The article is the text of Schiotz' testimony before the House Judiciary Committee on May 7, 1964, wherein he expressed his strong opposition to the pending resolutions on constitutional amendment.

[7] "Report of the President," Reports and Actions, 1964, p. 84.

In other matters, the president has endorsed birth control,[1] pleaded for legislative control of the use of firearms,[2] and indicated concern for the plight of the California grape workers.[3] However, he rejects use of the boycott by the church in support of the workers. On the other hand he endorsed church participation in Project Equality, claiming that the selective purchasing program is in support of existing federal law.

Division of Youth Activity

Among the units of the ALC, the Division of Youth Activity also has been instrumental in helping the church relate its mission to social problems and public issues. The significance of its contribution stems not so much from the particular issues it has considered but from its attempt to create styles of involvement in and confrontation with the more significant problems and issues of the period for the youth of the church. In contrast, the activity of the Commission on Research and Social Action focused on the articulation of social statements and study materials.

The speakers at the triennial conventions of the Luther League, the youth auxiliary of the church, have pointed out to

---

1. Fredrik Schiotz, "Birth Control Has a Place," The Lutheran Standard, January 25, 1966, p. 13.

2. Fredrik Schiotz, "Grief," The Lutheran Standard, June 25, 1968, p. 20.

3. Fredrik Schiotz, "Background of a Boycott," The Lutheran Standard, May 13, 1969, p. 14.

XUM

youth the importance of involving faith with the problems of life. The focus of the first convention in 1961 was on race relations. Martin Luther King, Jr., was the featured speaker in spite of efforts by the district presidents to force a last minute cancellation of his appearance "because of his affiliation with movements that tend to arouse the passions of people."[1] Walter Reuther was featured at the 1964 convention and Paul Simon, then an Illinois state senator, at the 1967 convention. Several contemporary problems, including race relations, Communism, drugs, military service, world hunger and development, and marriage and sex, were considered at youth leadership training conferences and in study materials as well as in the conventions of the youth organizations.

The Division of Youth Activity also has conducted a number of experimental projects seeking to provide avenues for encounter with social problems. It has supported the Plymouth Youth Center in Minneapolis, an agency for underpriviledged and delinquent youth, and has used the Center as a focal point for weekend trips of rural and small-town youth to better understand the problems of urban life and problems.[2] Volunteer service programs for both high school and college youth have been encouraged. In 1967 Ewald Bash devised a "crisis colony" as part

---

[1] Letter from district presidents to L. David Brown, dated July 10, 1961.

[2] "Objectives for 1967-68," Appendix B in Minutes of the Board of Youth Activity, November 6-8, 1967.

7

XUM

of the Division's experimental approach.[1] The crisis colony is an innovative program with college credit in crisis areas with minority persons providing an introduction to the problems of the area as well as sensitivity to the residents. The Division of Youth Activity also developed strategies for youth to stimulate discussion of racial problems in their local communities.[2]

One of the most successful projects of the Division has been its "Strategies for Mission" program.[3] Organized around the youth in a congregation, the project involves the creation of a task force to analyze social problems in the community of the local church, to identify priorities among the problems, and to develop specific strategies for mobilizing the membership to confront the problems. "Strategies for Mission" is the first comprehensive effort within the ALC to relate the mission of the congregation to community problems. Begun in a selected number of pilot areas in 1967, the project has now been adopted by the ALC as one of its primary long term responses to the challenge of the national crisis.[4]

---

1. Minutes of the Board of Youth Activity, March 18-19, 1968, p. 146. The crisis colony approach also is explained in "A Rationale for the Crisis Colony Approach to Education," prepared by Ewald Bash in 1969.

2. Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Board of Youth Activity, April 29, 1968, p. 152.

3. Cf. "Strategies for Mission Parish Manual," prepared by Ray Johnson and Robert Vogel, August, 1968.

4. Cf. Chapter 7, p. 241f.

Division of College Education

Another unit of the ALC which has attempted to create new approaches to social involvement has been the Division of College Education, particularly in the creative work of Loren Halvorson. As with the Division of Youth Activity, Halvorson's efforts have been directed more toward the creation of styles of involvement rather than attention to specific social issues.

Influenced by the example of lay academies in Germany following the Second World War, Halvorson developed a series of retreats and lay schools of theology in several areas of the ALC.[1] These frequently were located at the church colleges. Retreats brought together persons from similar vocations for the purpose of considering vocational problems from the perspective of Christian faith and ethics. The lay schools provided an occasion whereby laymen could deepen their theological understanding for engagement in community affairs under the tutelege of outstanding Christian leaders.

In 1963 Halvorson was seeking additional ways to bring about creative interaction by the church in society. His experience with retreats and lay schools convinced him that greater impact could be achieved by using the setting of natural communities, that is, the normal setting in which people live and work rather than an artificial community formed on the basis of vocations as in the retreat approach. Modifying the approach of the German "Kirchentag" which focuses community attention upon the interaction of faith and life, Halvorson undertook an experiment in Brookings, South Dakota, using the entire community as a laboratory for dialogue relating faith to community problems through discussion groups, conferences, seminars, and the mass media.[1] As the "Faith-in-Life Dialogue" gained ecumenical support, the experiment moved to the Fargo-Moorhead region of North Dakota and Minnesota in 1964 and to the Duluth-Superior area in 1965. The project in the latter area involved more than one hundred resource persons. Approximately 200 observers from other communities around the country were present to consider the potential of the encounter for their areas. In 1966 the project was carried to the Minneapolis-St. Paul area where it adapted a modified town meeting approach to the study of metropolitan problems.

---

[1] Loren Halvorson has discussed the development of his work with this writer a number of times during the past two years. Cf. Minutes of the Board of College Education, October 5, 1960, p. 51, Exhibit B; Minutes, October 2-4, 1961, Exhibit C.

In 1967 Loren Halvorson was turning his attention to the possibility of developing centers of specialized studies at the ALC colleges.[2] Under initial $50,000 seed money grants from the

---

[1] A description of the development of the "Faith-in-Life Dialogue" can be found in Faith and Life Dialogue: Northern Lake Dialogue 1965, prepared by the Minnesota Project. The report is available from the ALC Division of College Education.

[2] Cf. "The Community Is the Classroom," The Lutheran Standard, April 29, 1969, pp. 20-21.

ALC's Board of College Education, centers have now been established at Augsburg College (Minneapolis), Pacific Lutheran University (Tacoma), Augustana College (Sioux Fall, S.D.), and Concordia College (Moorhead, Minnesota). The centers serve as vehicles for developing coalitions among churches, educational institutions, and civic organizations for mobilizing support for new approaches to community problems.

Periodicals of the Church

Current social issues also have been treated in the church's periodicals during this period. The main ALC periodical is The Lutheran Standard, the official bi-monthly publication of the ALC. Its circulation is approximately 300,000, reaching 35-40% of the homes of church members.[1] The men's auxiliary, American Lutheran Church Men, publishes Event. The monthly magazine is sent to approximately 10,000 subscribers.[2] Prior to 1969 it circulated under the name, Greater Works. Scope is published monthly by the American Lutheran Church Women, the women's auxiliary, for more than 315,000 readers.[3] The Division of Youth Activity does not presently publish a

---

1. Information furnished by the Editorial Office of The Lutheran Standard, November 25, 1969.

2. Information provided by the editorial assistant of Event. Thom Speckenbach, November 25, 1969.

3. Information provided by the national office of the American Lutheran Church Women, November 25, 1969.

XUM

magazine. Until late 1968, however, it cooperated with the youth departments of other Lutheran churches in the successive joint publication of One, Arena One, and Edge. The maximum circulation of the youth publication in the ALC was 10,000-12,000 copies.[1]

The Lutheran Standard has carried a considerable number of feature articles and editorials on problems in American society. From 1961 through 1969, 237 features and 96 editorials had been devoted to various social and political problems.[2] E. W. Schramm, editor from 1961 through 1966, and George Muedeking, editor since 1967, both have been sensitive to social concerns. Muedeking has given increased coverage to social issues in the recent period. For example, approximately 39% of the feature articles and 47% of the editorials on social issues have appeared since the beginning of 1967. Under Schramm's leadership feature articles on social issues averaged 23.8 per year. Under Muedeking these increased to 31.3 per year. Similarly, prior to 1967 social editorials averaged 8.5 per year, while they have increased to 15 per year since that time. For purposes of analysis these articles and editorials have been examined in seven major categories: church and society, citizenship and political rights, family life and health, church and state, economic and social life, race relations, and international affairs.

---

[1] Information provided by the Division of Youth Activity, November 26, 1969.

[2] A tabulation of the feature articles and editorials focusing on social issues is included in the Appendix, Table 2, pp. 354-55.

Feature articles on race relations have been the most numerous. Seventy-three features, or one-third of the total number, treated various dimensions of American race relations. These included articles on the nature of discrimination, the responsibility of the church in race relations, racial protests both in the South and in Northern cities, civil rights legislation, ghetto life and conditions, Black Power, religious interracial programs, the recommendations of the Kerner Commission, and the need for attitudinal changes. Six of the 73 features considered the problems of Indian Americans. While there were many articles on race relations each year since 1961, almost one-half of these have appeared since the beginning of 1967. As might be expected, the articles in this category spoke favorably of integration, civil rights legislation, and interreligious church projects.

International affairs features numbered 51 articles, a little more than 20% of the total features on social issues. Communism, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, fallout shelters, world hunger and population growth, pacifism and war, Vietnam, and American immigration policy were among the subjects treated. Generally, the articles attempted better to acquaint the reader with the problems. The articles on Communism, most of which appeared as a series in 1961, were written from a perspective which viewed Communism as a demonic monolithic international conspiracy.

Another 20% of the feature articles considered social and economic concerns. Included in this category were articles relating to poverty, protest over the draft and the war in Vietnam, labor and agricultural problems, "law and order," pornography, crime, and auto safety. Despite the rural setting of the ALC, only five articles related to problems of rural America. An analysis of the features also revealed that significant attention to poverty problems did not begin to appear until 1968. Protest over the war in Vietnam, the draft, and university reform also received significant coverage in 1968 and 1969. The features on "law and order" and protest were generally sympathetic to the concerns of civil libertarians. Nineteen articles on social and economic issues appeared in 1969 in contrast to an average of four in each of the preceding seven years.

Of the remaining 28% of the feature articles on social issues, approximately one-half related to various aspects of citizenship and political rights, including voting, political extremism, reapportionment, and home rule for the District of Columbia. Many of these articles sought to encourage more active citizen involvement. Articles in this category have declined in the past few years.

Articles in the remaining categories were few in number. Less than six percent were devoted to problems of church-state relations. Most of these supported the decisions of the Supreme Court concerning Bible reading and prayer in the schools and opposed the extention of federal aid to parochial schools. Concerns of family life and health were marriage and divorce, alcoholism, and cigarette smoking. Most of the articles concerned with the role of the church in society appeared immediately following the merger.

During the nine year period, The Lutheran Standard printed 95 editorials on various social issues. The categories of race relations, international affairs, and social and economic life each received about twenty percent of the total. Citizenship and political rights received 13 editorials; family life and health, ten; and problems in church-state relations, nine. Only five editorials were devoted to the question of the task of the church in society.

The editorials on race relations endorsed integration and civil rights efforts and called for a change in racial attitudes in America, including the members of the ALC. While the editorials recognized that the membership of the ALC was centered in areas of the United States containing few black Americans, they stated that the members' apathy contributed to racial injustice for Indian Americans as well as blacks. In 1968, a number of editorials called upon the church and the nation to respond to the problems caused by racial injustice. The Lutheran Standard also endorsed Project Equality. Only one editorial concerning race relations appeared in 1969, commenting on the Black Manifesto. Unlike the Church Council, which looked at the intent of the Manifesto, The Lutheran Standard focused its attention upon the inflammatory language in the preamble and called upon the police power of the state to protect the church from disruption.

Editorials on international affairs concentrated on Communism and the war in Vietnam. While all the editorials rejected Communism as a form of government, they also rejected the ideology and methods of militant anti-Communist organizations. Editorials emphasized the need for increased efforts to promote peace, warned about the futility of the arms build-up, and criticized American policy toward Panama. The first editorial on the war in Vietnam appeared in December, 1965.[1] It condemned as "morally devious" the efforts of the American government to convey to the public the impression that Hanoi had never indicated willingness to negotiate. It held that such "evasiveness and misrepresentation" created dismay and distrust of the government. In 1967 no less than six editorials appeared on Vietnam. Muedeking, the editor, sharply criticized American involvement in the war and called upon Christians to protest the war's continuance. He emphasized that the undeclared nature of the war, the high rate of civilian casualties, and opposition by many international jurists as well as the World Council of Churches, the National Council of Churches, and many Christian leaders, made the war a "Christian issue." The Lutheran Standard reported that it received 20 to 25 times as much reader response to Muedeking's editorial as for any other previous editorial with 65% supporting it.[2] Positive support from clergy was 74% and from laymen, 54%. In 1969 Muedeking twice stated his opposition to the development of the ABM and rising military expenditures.

---

[1] "The Things of Caesar," The Lutheran Standard, December 28, 1965, p. 14.

[2] Editorial, "The Respondents on Vietnam," The Lutheran Standard, August 8, 1967, p. 15.

Most of the editorials on social and economic life have appeared since 1965. Prior to that time, editorials had called for a reduction in the high unemployment rate, blamed churches for contributing to the increasing crime rate by leaving the inner city for the suburbs, and commended the Division of Youth Activity for inviting Walter Reuther to address the triennial Luther League Convention. In 1965 editorials focused upon the poor, encouraging members to assist public welfare agencies as volunteers and commending the federal war on poverty program. Editorials in 1968 and 1969 treated the concerns of social protest. They warned against voter backlash in the presidential election, criticized the excessive actions of the police at the Democratic National Convention, objected to General Lewis Hershey's order to draft protesters, affirmed the positive values in student protests, and urged a reordering of national priorities. Editorials also criticized the 1968 General Convention for rejecting support for selective conscientious objection and called for affirmation of the position at the 1970 General Convention. Other editorials criticized the release of criminals for police violation of procedural rights, urged greater highway safety, called for stronger control of firearms, and emphasized the problem of environmental pollution.

More active citizen participation in public life and more discriminating political judgments were the themes of many editorials concerning citizenship and political rights. Other editorials criticized the Ku Klux Klan, commended Senator Eugene McCarthy for his contribution to American political life in 1968, and supported the Amish right of conscience.

Cigarette smoking and abortion reform were the major subjects of family life and health. Six editorials emphasized the danger of smoking and called for strong legal control of cigarette advertising. In 1968 Muedeking penned three editorials strongly opposing any liberalization of state abortion laws, claiming that abortion, except for therapeutic reasons, is a denial of Christian reverence for life.

Editorials on church-state questions focused on aid to education and Supreme Court decisions early in the 1960's. Federal aid to religious elementary and secondary schools was opposed and the Supreme Court's ban against the use of government prescribed prayer was supported, although the editorials were concerned lest neutrality become anti-religious. In 1969 editorials called for caution in the removal of tax exemptions from church property, pointing to the fear of state control over religious activities.

In addition to The Lutheran Standard, the auxiliaries of the church also have published periodicals. The American Lutheran Church Men published Greater Works from 1961 through 1968. Edited by W. Herbert Kent, the monthly magazine devoted most of its attention to program helps for men's groups in the church, personal Christian growth, and interest in church renewal. Usually less than half a dozen feature articles and

XUM

about the same number of editorials appeared on social issues in the average year. Major editorial focus was given to extremism and race relations. After Kent became executive director of the auxiliary, James Solheim became editor in the last half of 1968 and in 1969 introduced Event as a successor to Greater Works. Since then each issue has been devoted to major treatment of some current issue. The magazine has focused on Indian Americans, issues in the presidential election, "law and order," consumerism, the communications media, the rural crisis, the draft, the right wing in the church, and the student revolt in the universities. Event has become the ALC periodical devoted specifically to current issues.

The American Lutheran Church Women, the women's auxiliary, also produces a monthly publication, Scope. Since 1961 the magazine has been concerned with personal Christian growth, Bible studies, world missions, and program helps. While a couple of very brief articles on social problems appeared each year, the publication was almost devoid of concern for social problems.

The Division of Youth Activity cooperated with the youth departments of other Lutheran churches in the successive joint publication of One, Arena One, and Edge. One was published until 1965 and contained four or five features each year on current problems. Arena One, published in 1967, featured articles on world hunger, draft reform, crime, and race relations. Edge, published from November 1967 through

October 1968, treated politics, inner city needs, race relations, world hunger, the Job Corps, and drugs.

Social Issues in the ALC

This examination of social concerns and public policy issues in the ALC reveals that the church devoted attention to many of the problems of the period. Current issues were treated in study documents and social policy statements by the Commission on Research and Social Action, by the Church Council, and by the General Conventions of the church as well as through significant efforts by the Divisions of Youth Activity and College Education. The president of the ALC and the several periodicals also helped focus the mind of the church upon social problems and issues.

Issues relating to the role of the church in society, race relations, marriage and family life, church-state relations, and international affairs were the major subjects of concern. A considerable amount of the time of the Commission on Research and Social Action and the Church Council was devoted to a consideration of the role of the church in society. This topic and questions of church-state relations received more attention from these two units than from any other single category of social issues. During its first ten years of existence the ALC has been very concerned about its own identity as a social institution and its proper role in society. Most of the questions on church-state relations concerned the institutional interests of the ALC. Only a few of these questions advanced beyond the self-interest of the church.

The Commission on Research and Social Action and the Church Council, along with President Schiotz and The Lutheran Standard, placed considerable emphasis upon race relations. In fact, the concern of American race relations quantitatively received more attention from these and other ALC national offices than any other single problem. The strong interest of Schiotz in human relations has certainly been one factor in this development. Another factor is the membership and location of the ALC membership; the ALC is largely an upper midwest, rural oriented, church with few black members. This factor should not serve to detract from the ALC's record in race relations, but it does help explain why the ALC could devote attention to race relations without serious opposition within the church. On the other hand, the problems of Indian Americans and migrant workers have received very little attention.

Many of the ALC's efforts on social issues have been studies or statements attempting to help the members understand social problems from the perspective of Christian faith. The ALC national offices have engaged in very few action projects designed to change social problems. The efforts of the ALC have followed the pattern described in the previous chapter, that is, focusing attention on current problems in order that individual members might take action which they consider appropriate.

While the ALC has given considerable treatment to many of the pressing problems of the period, there also are a number of issues to which it gave, at best, passing reference. Medical care and service to the aged, the war on poverty, reapportionment, the unemployed and labor relations, consumer protection, gun regulation, drug control, arms limitation, national priorities, environmental pollution, agricultural problems, welfare and tax reform, organ transplants, and specific international problems of the period were given very little examination. Thus many major problems of the sixties were virtually ignored by the ALC. The limitation of staff time is certainly one reason for these gaps. But another factor is the failure to develop an adequate planning process within the ALC to anticipate and to respond to public issues.[1]

This study revealed that most of the issues were considered after the issues had already received national attention. The issue of Communism treated by the Commission on Research and Social Action in the early 1960's was more appropriate to the period of the 1950's. It must be remembered, however, that the ALC did not begin its work until 1961. The ALC was considerably behind national public concern for problems of poverty, race relations, and the war in Vietnam. The church tended to focus attention upon problems after the basic patterns for the future had been established. Many of the positions taken thus helped to create a better understanding of what was taking place and to consolidate support for emerging patterns. But little effort was used to focus upon emerging issues and problems and to help create public support for various courses of action.

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 7, p. 219, and Chapter 8, pp. 270-71.

The next chapter will focus upon the activity of the ALC in response to the national crisis in race during the past two years and reflect on the political awareness of the ALC in that situation.

Filmed as received

without page(s) 212 .

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

numerous resolutions in support of racial equality. The Commission, along with the Division of Youth Activity and The Lutheran Standard, also had produced a considerable number of study materials and articles on the subject of race. But these efforts lacked any coordinated churchwide action; they were limited efforts on the part of one or another unit of the church. They also treated the problem of race relations as one among many other social problems; the crisis dimension of the problem was not yet sensed.

By late 1967, however, there were indications that the urban racial crisis was beginning to be felt in some of the ALC national offices. Ewald Bash, a staff executive in the Division of Youth Activity, was experimenting with the model of a college course designed to thrust students into the midst of crisis communities and learn about the community and its problems firsthand from the black residents.[1] He also, it will be recalled, had developed a weekend program for bringing rural youth into the inner city. At the same time, the Division of American Missions was struggling with the form of its urban involvement. While the board rejected a proposal to assist the construction of low-cost housing in the new city of Columbia, Maryland, it did establish a committee to restudy its metropolitan work.[2] In another area, the Division of Theological

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 6, pp. 195-96.

[2] Minutes of the Board of American Missions, November 28-30, 1967, pp. 408, 417-18.

Education began an examination of its recruitment of minority students for the theological seminaries.[1] Augsburg Publishing House, the trade name of the Division of Publication, also joined Project Equality in early 1968.[2]

The most specific effort to devise a coordinated ALC thrust came from E. H. Schalkhauser in the Commission on Evangelism and from the expressions of the Commission on Research and Social Action. The 1966 General Convention had directed the Commission on Evangelism in cooperation with the other units of the church to give emphasis to "an accelerated program of evangelism in the inner city" with an approach to community racial integration.[3] But the mandate lay dormant until the summer and fall of 1967 when the director of the Commission on Evangelism, Conrad Thompson, began planning for an evangelism thrust throughout the ALC that was to culminate with the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the church in the spring of 1970.[4] Meeting with unenthusiastic responses on the part of other departments, Thompson unilaterally pressed ahead with his plans, personally visiting with each of the district presidents in advance of Church Council consideration of his recommendation.

---

1. Minutes of the Board of Theological Education, September 25-26, 1967, p. 21.

2. Interview with Albert Anderson, assistant general manager of Augsburg Publishing House, July 18, 1969.

3. *Reports and Actions*, 1966, pp. 474-75.

4. Interview with Conrad Thompson, July 22, 1969.

During the same period, Schalkhauser, realizing that the traditional evangelistic appeal of the Commission on Evangelism was an inadequate response to the national racial crisis, drafted a plan for the creation of an interdepartmental task force to forge a broad ALC response.[1] The plan envisioned a series of "happenings" for metropolitan pastors and laymen, leading to strategic action responses in each community. The plan called for the utilization of professional mass communication and educational skills. Staff was to be seconded from many ALC units. Schalkhauser's plan was the first specific attempt to mobilize an ALC response to the crisis. It failed to materialize, however, due to the more traditional evangelistic concerns of his own commission, the lack of interest and thus commitment on the part of the executive directors of many departments, and the absence of coordinating leadership from the office of the president.

The racial crisis was also making a strong impact on the Commission on Research and Social Action. At the December, 1967, meeting of the Commission, the staff was urged to suggest possible courses of action to the districts, congregations, and national offices. The Commission also requested that the 1968 General Convention devote special attention to the crisis and directed that the urban crisis be the main focus at the May meeting of the Commission in Detroit.[1] In February, prior to the meeting of the Church Council, the Commission endorsed Project Equality, requested President Schiotz to initiate efforts in cooperation with other national religious leaders to mobilize religious support for the national Urban Coalition, and urged the appointment of a special assistant to the president to coordinate the ALC response to the crisis.[2]

---

[1] "Mobilizing ALC Ministries for Urban Needs," prepared by E. W. Schalkhauser.

The Letter from Detroit

The spark which ignited the ALC coordinated response to the crisis was a letter, dated February 2, 1968, from several Detroit pastors and laymen to the president of the church. The three-page letter indicted the president, the Church Council, and the boards of the ALC for "the lack of understanding being shown at the national level of our church. It seems to us as though the urban crisis has no influence in the way the ALC defines its mission in America." Citing the leadership of other denominational leaders, the letter urged the priority attention be given to racial justice:

> . . . The corporate witness of the Church is essential if we are to make any progress at the grassroots. Without your support and encouragement we are isolated individuals who speak only for ourselves. We believe and urgently request that the

---

[1] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, December 4-5, 1967, pp. 4-5.

[2] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, February 16-17, 1968, pp. 3, 5.

Chapter VII

THE ALC AND THE NATIONAL CRISIS IN RACE RELATIONS

The reality of the national crisis in race relations hit the leadership of the ALC like a shock wave in early 1968. The urban disorders of the previous summers, especially Detroit in 1967, had created a growing sense of urgency in the minds of the church's leaders about the depth of the frustrations of black America. But it took a letter from several Detroit pastors and laymen in February of 1968 to mobilize a broad ALC response to the crisis.

Background to Action

The concern of race relations and racial justice had not, as has been indicated, been wholly absent from the ALC. President Schiotz had long pleaded for fair housing and civil rights legislation and his support of Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference was a matter of public record.[1] The Commission on Research and Social Action and the General Conventions of the church had adopted

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 6, p. 187f.

> ALC put its commitment and resources where its resolutions are. The day of resolutions has passed. We must now show by our financial commitment that our statements and resolutions are not pious sops thrown to the oppressed.
>
> We are convinced that the Church must see and define its mission in relation to the Negro quest for identity and place in American society. American missions can no longer justify establishing congregations in suburban areas if it is not willing to actively seek to change the segregated system which excludes the poor and the black. . . . It must make absolutely clear to all its members that the quest for justice is at the top of its priority list.
>
> . . .
>
> The urgency of the situation cannot be overemphasized. We, as the ALC, must decide whether or not the crisis facing our nation and her cities is any of our business. We believe that a definite statement and follow-up action by you and our national boards which leave no doubt about the ALC's position is imperative. We are in the midst of a revolution. Unless we use all the resources available to us we will be guilty of fiddling while our nation burns. As an institution in society with economic and moral power, we have the moral obligation to support the Black community in its struggle for hope and dignity. We must recognize the legitimacy of the black man's cause and the rightness of his quest! We must run the risk of alienating many of our people by speaking against the injustice and racism which is so much a part of our legal, economic and social system.

The letter concluded with several recommendations to implement the concern in the ALC.

The Detroit letter arrived just prior to a meeting of the Church Council on February 21-22. It was interpreted as "an anguished cry to the church to recognize the depth of bias and discrimination that has fathered the urban tension of today."[1]

---

[1] Fredrik Schiotz, "The Prior Need," The Lutheran Standard, April 2, 1968, p. 13.

The Church Council responded positively by acknowledging "the shortcomings of our church in the area of social concern and our insensitivity to the minority and poverty problems of our nation and [requesting] the president of The American Lutheran Church to invite suggestions for programs that might be constructively undertaken by The American Lutheran Church and her congregations."[1] The Church Council also requested the Divisions of American Missions and Social Service, the Commission on Research and Social Action, and the Board of Trustees "to provide such possible assistance and service as may help to meet the needs of those persons who reside in ghettos and poverty-stricken areas." Finally, it authorized the one-year appointment of a special assistant to the president to coordinate the ALC effort.

The response of the president was immediate.[2] He selected H. Manford Knudsvig, director of the Department of Metropolitan Ministry in the Division of American Missions, as his special assistant to act as liaison between the office of president and the ALC departments most involved in the urban crisis as well as with the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. and the National Council of Churches. He also formed an advisory group, the President's Advisory Coordinating Committee on the National Crisis, to chart the ALC direction, and named a committee composed of the executive directors of the Divisions of

---

[1] Minutes of the Church Council, February 22, 1968, p. 11.

[2] Because this writer was so closely involved with many of these developments only selected source materials are cited hereafter.

XUM

American Missions and Social Service plus Knudsvig to review funding requests for special crisis projects. Knudsvig also was to serve as a coordinator for action throughout the ALC.[1] The advisory council met six times between March and July to give coordinated direction to the crisis activity of the ALC..

At the first meeting of the advisory committee, President Schiotz indicated his commitment to the task by stating: "We are in this struggle to the finish and are anxious to do our part."[2] It shortly became evident, however, that the ALC response was going to be limited by two crucial factors. The first handicap was the absence of a planning process for the development of strategy for the use of the church's expertise and resources. Knudsvig responded to a query about the goals and strategy of action by stating: "We don't have time to get involved in the paralysis of analysis!"[3] An effort was made to devise some objectives to guide the advisory council, but they were never seriously used in the subsequent discussions. In the second meeting of the advisory council, two weeks later, the president and Knudsvig informed the council that Project Summer Hope would be the primary ALC response to the crisis. The absence of a planning process also was reflected in the lack of any comprehensive evaluation or planned follow-up to

---

1. Minutes of the President's Staff Advisory Coordinating Committee for the Urban Crisis, March 13, 1968, p. 1.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

3. Comment made during the meeting of the President's Staff Advisory Committee, March 13, 1968.

Project Summer Hope at the end of the summer.[1] Thus despite the continued assurances of the president's special assistant, the ALC's multi-departmental response to the national crisis in 1968 was a "crash" program for the summer only. In addition, the absence of members of the black community in the discussion indicated considerable insensitivity on the part of the ALC leadership to the very crisis about which it voiced concern.[2]

The other factor limiting the effectiveness of the ALC response was a reluctance, indeed a refusal, by the office of president to provide the necessary coordination for the combined effort. A number of the executive directors pleaded with both Knudsvig and the president that staff and resources should be pooled in order to achieve a significant response. But the offers of the services at least three executive staff persons to assist Knudsvig were never accepted,[1] and the call for coordinated planning by the special assistant was refused. Schiotz indicated that action must come from the separate departments[2] and that special funding requested should be channeled to the committee of Lechleitner, Boe, and Knudsvig. After much frustration the advisory committee finally called upon the Commission on Research and Social Action to consider longer term ALC responses to the national crisis.[3] Beyond the launching project, the meetings of the advisory committee were mainly "show-tell" sessions.

---

[1] The district coordinators of Project Summer Hope were called together on September 9, 1968, for the expressed purpose of evaluating Project Summer Hope and discussing subsequent action. Most of the day was used for a district-by-district description of what had occurred as a result of the project. The question of follow-up action was raised by the special assistant only in the last one-half hour of the session. The district coordinators left the meeting very discouraged about the failure of the special assistant to give leadership to follow-up planning.

[2] Black persons were conspicuously absent in the planning of the ALC response to the national crisis. None were present at the first meeting of the President's Advisory Committee. President Schiotz appeared somewhat annoyed when it was suggested that minority participation was essential. A black social worker was present for part of the second meeting, but only at the special invitation of one of the executive directors. Nelson Trout, a black executive with the Commission on Evangelism was insignificantly involved in the work of the group.

Project Summer Hope

"Project Summer Hope" was a modification of "Focus: Summer Hope," a program developed by the Roman Catholic diocese of Detroit. The program attempted to confront the members of the ALC with the need to change racial attitudes. Project Summer Hope was a "crash" educational thrust whose goal was "to sensitize the conscience of all our people to the injustice we Christians and American citizens generally have allowed to become the lot of millions of minority people in our land."[1]

---

[1] Conrad Thompson, executive director of the Commission on Evangelism, offered the services of Nelson Trout and E. W. Schalkhauser to help H. Manford Knudsvig "in any way he desires to utilize their services." Minutes of the President's Staff Advisory Coordinating Committee on the Urban Crisis, March 13, 1968, p. 5. Paul Boe, executive director of the Division of Social Service, once mentioned to this writer that he also had offered the services of one of his staff members to the president's special assistant.

[2] Minutes of the President's Staff Advisory Coordinating Committee on the Urban Crisis, May 2, 1968, pp. 1-2. President Schiotz seemed to operate under the supposition that coordination, in the sense of joint planning and implementation, somehow vitiates the separate responsibilities given to the program divisions of the church. He told one executive director that adequate coordination could be achieved by one executive discussing work with another one.

[3] Ibid., p. 2.

The key to Project Summer Hope was study of the racial crisis in small groups in the congregations, preferably in homes. It was suggested that pastors devote the sermons on the last Sunday in May and the first Sunday in June to the problem of discrimination, followed by home and congregational meetings to discuss the racial crisis, using the Kerner Report as the primary resource. The study was intended to initiate congregational action with respect to the crisis. Materials for congregational use had been prepared by an interdepartmental staff team and included a recorded message from President Schiotz, sermon helps and worship suggestions, a summary of the Kerner Report, guides for the three proposed home and congregational meetings, and other items.

In order to help congregations prepare for the project, each district selected a coordinator whose purpose was to focus attention on the national crisis within the district. The 18 district coordinators were briefed on the program in early April. Their main efforts were spent in discussing the racial crisis in district and conference pastoral meetings and at the district conventions in late spring.

---

1. Pastoral Letter, April 5, 1968.

It is difficult to provide any adequate evaluation of the effect of Project Summer Hope. Knudsvig estimated that more than 90% of the ALC's 4900 congregations participated in some phases of the program.[1] The reports of the district coordinators in September, 1968, indicated that the project had indeed served to sound a clarion call throughout the church.[2] They indicated that numerous congregations had initiated contacts with minority persons during the period. Most of the interviewed church leaders expressed their belief that the project had significantly advanced the church's awareness of its social responsibility, but they were greatly disappointed in the lack of better planning and any follow-up preparation. Some bluntly stated that the manner in which Project Summer Hope was planned evidenced the ALC's basic lack of understanding the crisis.

The Inner City Organizes

The national crisis probably affected the Division of American Missions more than any other single department of the ALC. During the winter and spring of 1968 pressures continued to increase within that division for a change in the nature of its metropolitan, especially its inner city, involvement. From

---

[1] Stated orally a number of times.

[2] The district reports are appended to the agenda for the consultation with the district coordinators, September 9, 1968.

1961 through 1967 a total of 282 congregations had been established, most of them on the growing suburban fringes of the cities.[1] Due to increasing costs, the subsidy provided to these new congregations had increased from $313,000 in 1961 to over $1,750,000 in 1967, even though fewer congregations were begun in 1967 than in any other year. During the same period the number of urban congregations receiving aid had increased from six in 1961 to 87 in 1967 with the subsidy increasing from less than forty thousand dollars to over $400,000. The pressure within the Division of American Missions was for a greater shift of priorities to the needs of the inner city churches.

For years the main focus of American Missions had been the establishment of new congregations in the country's suburban areas. The executive director of the division, R. Dale Lechleitner, strongly resisted the shift to the inner city. He claimed that no more than ten percent of the operational budget should be devoted to work in the black communities.[2] But in 1968 only 16 suburban congregations were begun and subsidies to the young church were reduced $200,000 from the previous year. At the same time the number of urban churches receiving subsidy continued to climb, reaching a total subsidy of nearly $500,000. The latter figure increased by another 50%

---

1. These and the following statistics were obtained from the Division of American Missions.

2. "Report of the Executive Director to the Board of American Missions," April 10, 1967, p. 96.

in 1969 and will reach nearly $1 million in 1970.

The increase in urban subsidy congregations pointed to deepening urban ills and was itself a partial reflection of the national crisis. Inner city pastors had been seeking a conference to articulate their concerns and press for the shift in priorities. In April, 1968, the Department of Metropolitan Ministry forced the staff to call an inner city meeting and named a committee composed primarily of inner city pastors and laymen, one-half of whom were black, to plan the conference.[1] In May the Board of American Missions identified the conference as "the number one priority concern" of the Department of Metropolitan Ministry.[2]

The Conference of Inner City Clergy and Laity convened June 21-23, 1968, with over 100 delegates. It was an angry meeting, reflecting the chasm between the inner city and the ALC as well as the lack of confidence by the inner city pastors in the staff of the Division of American Missions. Perhaps the greatest achievement is that the conference took place at all. The meeting produced an avalanche of resolutions, relating to racism, education, employment, the war and most of the other great problems of the time, and called upon the ALC to commit itself to the task of social and racial justice both in the

---

[1] Minutes of the Department of Metropolitan Ministry, April 17-19, 1968, p. 329.

[2] Minutes of the Board of American Missions, May 20-22, 1968, pp. 175-76.

XUM

church and in society at large.[1] The conference created a twenty-member Committee on Inner City Ministries, led by a black businessman, to continue to press the ALC for change in its priorities. The Church Council had confessed its indifference and insensitivity to problems of racial justice in February and called the church to repentance; the inner city pastors and laymen now called the ALC to action.

At its meeting in September, 1968, the Board of American Missions agreed to cooperate with the Committee of Inner City Ministries and allowed the inner city group to name three advisory members to the Department of Metropolitan Ministry.[2] At the same time the board agreed to participate in Project Equality[3] and, in a far-reaching resolution, initiated a review of its entire program.[4] The resolution directed that urban and racial areas were to receive priority consideration in the future use of the board's financial resources and anticipated the adoption of new innovative approaches in 1969. The Board of American Missions was responding to the national crisis.

---

1. Minutes of the National Conference of Inner City Clergy and Laity, June 21-23, 1968.

2. Minutes of the Board of American Missions, September 6-7, 1968, pp. 186-87.

3. Ibid., p. 189. In November, 1967, the Board had declined to formally participate in the program, even though it approved the principle of equal employment opportunity. Minutes of the Board of American Missions, November 28-30, 1967, p. 411.

4. Ibid., p. 195.

"Decision in a Time of National Crisis"

After the meeting of the Church Council in February and the formation of the President's Advisory Coordinating Committee on the National Crisis, a new awareness of the national crisis pervaded the national offices. The periodic meetings of the advisory council made each unit conscious of the ways in which other units were shaping their departmental actions in response to the crisis. Some departments projected plans for the future, the implementation of the plans being contingent upon the availability of additional funds. Some endeavors were little more than attempts to show the relationship of current activity to the crisis. In addition to the efforts of departments already mentioned, the changes which occurred in Board of Trustees are noteworthy.

The Detroit letter had, in particular, challenged the investment policies of the Board of Trustees. The initial response of the board in March was to reaffirm its policy on church investments which had been adopted in 1966.[1] Under that policy the board indicated its intention to make investments solely on economic criteria, although it would not knowingly invest in situations where civil and human rights were violated. By June, however, the board had appointed a committee to examine

---

[1] Minutes of the Board of Trustees, March 11-12, 1968, pp. 24-25. The policy was adopted in Minutes of Investment Committee of the Board of Trustees, March 14, 1966, p. 2.

XUM

the use of investment funds for high-risk, low-yield investments and in October it adopted a new policy wherein it recognized that not all socially-motivated investments incurred high-risk, low-yield results.[1] As a result of the review, the board announced at the 1968 General Convention that it was making $1,250,000 available for investment in minority mortgages, minority banks and savings and loan institutions, and in projects which encouraged open housing, and for seed money in federally-insured housing projects.[2] The board also cooperated with the National Alliance of Businessmen by providing ten jobs for the summer.[3]

As indicated earlier, the lack of long range planning, really the lack of a planning process, and the refusal of the office of president to provide coordinating leadership for the ALC's national crisis response apart from the educational thrust, Project Summer Hope, were disappointments to many of the executives. Action projects, interdepartmentally planned and implemented, seemed to many to offer better forms for education as well as models for similar activity throughout the church. During the period of Project Summer Hope only one major action project was funded by the ALC, a grant of $46,000 for the development and testing of a mass media communications approach to community action.[1] Numerous requests were submitted to the president for the creation of an interdepartmental task force, similar in intent to the original Schalkhauser proposal.[2] On May 2, the President's Advisory Committee requested the Commission on Research and Social Action to provide guidance on longer term responses to the crisis.[3]

---

[1] Minutes of the Board of Trustees, June 12-13, 1968, pp. 19-21; Minutes, October 15, 1968, p. 6, Exhibit A.

[2] "Report of the Board of Trustees," Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 205-209.

[3] Minutes of the Board of Trustees, June 12-13, 1968, p. 22.

The Commission accepted the request,[4] and Reuss assigned staff responsibility for the assignment to his assistant, Byron Schmid. Out of the numerous consultations which followed came a number of recommendations. These included the formulation of goals and programmatic objectives to guide a comprehensive ALC response to the crisis on a long term basis, the decision to draft a proposal establishing a permanent unit within the ALC to coordinate efforts aimed at racial and economic justice, and a call for the creation of a special crisis fund available to such a unit.[1]

---

[1] The project is described in "A Proposal for Development of a Minority Heritage Program," attached to Minutes of the President's Advisory Committee, May 2, 1968.

[2] Cf. "Proposals the Board of Youth Activity Might Make to the President of the American Lutheran Church with Special Reference to the Action of the Coordinating Committee on the Urban Crisis," Minutes of the Board of Youth Activity, March 18-19, 1968, pp. 148-49. The report was approved by the board. Cf. also Memorandum of Paul Boe, executive director of the Division of Social Service, to "Whom It May Concern," April 26, 1968.

[3] Minutes of the President's Advisory Committee, May 2, 1968, p. 2.

[4] Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, May 2-4, 1968, p. 2.

The formulation of goals and programmatic objectives began by obtaining the reaction of a number of convened executives, parish pastors, and minority group persons to a draft proposal prepared by Schmid. After numerous revisions the guidelines were included in the proposed policy statement, "The Challenge of the National Crisis," considered by the Church Council in June.[2] These guidelines constituted the main section of the statement, "Decision in a Time of National Crisis," subsequently adopted by the 1968 General Convention. In the latter document the ALC recognized the national crisis as "a ringing demand for justice and equity" and acknowledged responsibility to "develop programs for the promotion of human welfare. . . ." As objectives to guide ALC action it referred to the need for attitudinal changes, an awareness of the creative use of power for constructive social change, and a desire to "increase our sensitivity and response to the human needs and aspirations of minority and economically-deprived groups and persons, working with them to secure justice, equity, their share in, and their right to contribute to America's abundance, life, culture, and unity amid diversity." The statement included a commitment "to influence human lives, to respect the integrity of choices made in the free exercise of human dignity, to manifest the servant role of the church, and to effect needed changes in public opinion and in the structures of secular society." The following programmatic objectives were adopted:

---

[1] Cf. Memoranda from Byron Schmid to H. Manford Knudsvig, May 20 and May 29, 1969.

[2] This document, "The Challenge of the National Crisis," was referred back to the Commission on Research and Social Action with instructions to combine it with a revised form of "Proposal on Structure for More Effective ALC Response to the Challenge of Racial and Social Justice." Minutes of the Church Council, June 24-26, 1968, p. 37.

> a. Intensif[ication of] efforts to acquaint the unchurched, regardless of their race, nationality, or social standing, with the promises and power of Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior, and to welcome into the participating fellowship of the congregation all who accept His invitation to membership in His church.
>
> b. Increase [of] the level of theological study and understanding, among both pastors and lay persons, of the mission and strategy of the church in an era of rapid and planned social change.
>
> c. Encourage[ment to] congregations to establish small groups where fellowship and growth in Christian maturity may be nurtured, so as to motivate the members of these congregations for service to their brothers and for service in the structures of society.
>
> d. [Implementation of] an intensive educational effort in The American Lutheran Church to increase understanding of the heritage of minority groups, the dehumanizing nature of racism and poverty, and the relationship of Christian discipleship to justice and equity.
>
> e. Strengthen[ing of] the supportive services of The American Lutheran Church to its congregations, pastors, agencies, and institutions in the inner city, in dwindling rural communities, and in areas where minority and economically-deprived groups and persons are located.
>
> f. Involve[ment of] minority group persons in the decision-making processes of The American Lutheran Church, and . . . greater use[age] of minority group persons in the available employment opportunities at each level of The American Lutheran Church as corporate body.
>
> g. [F]ormulat[ion] and support [of] sound goals of public policy relating to justice and a responsive

society, especially focusing critical attention upon legislative, executive, and judicial efforts in the areas of housing, employment, education, welfare, health, and police and law enforcement practices.

h. Use [of] corporate purchasing power to advance racial and social justice by considering the factor of affirmative action for equal employment opportunity as well as quality, cost, and availability of service in contracting for goods, services, and construction.

i. Expan[sion of] financial and staff support to programs of community action and other cooperative ventures seeking justice and equity, where their aims, objectives, medthods, and techniques are deemed by responsible boards, institutions, and units of the church to be compatible with those of The American Lutheran Church.

j. Provid[ing of] information on effective current programs and projects, and propose specific innovative or experimental programs which can be considered and adopted by groups within The American Lutheran Church, and assist, as resources permit, in the development of such programs and projects.

k. Expan[sion of] educational opportunities, especially for the recruitment of church workers, through such means as (1) increased scholarships and remedial education programs for minority persons previous to entering and in their studies at the colleges and theological seminaries of The American Lutheran Church and (2) provision for specialized in-service training for those who serve the church in ghettos, poverty areas, and other situations of injustice and inequity.

l. Use [of the] investment funds of The American Lutheran Church, its congregations, and institutions, in such enterprises and activities as will benefit minority or economically-deprived peoples, to such degree and in such manner as those who bear legal responsibility for these funds may determine.

m. Place[ment of] priorities on uses of funds which maximize programs and services to people and minimize investment in physical plant and facilities.

n. Cooperat[ion], where possible and in accord with Lutheran theology, with churches and members of all Christian communions in renewal, witness, and service.

The effort to assign responsibility for the concerns of racial and social justice was a much more difficult task than the formulation of goals and programmatic objectives. In fact, Reuss indicated that the "task of recommending an appropriate follow-up to Project Summer Hope, with the lodging of responsibility for effective leadership, has been the most confusing, even frustrating, assignment ever given me to undertake on behalf of the Commission."[1] The proposal to lodge responsibility went through seven major and several minor revisions prior to General Convention consideration of the measure.

The proposals attempted to assign responsibility for more extensive interdepartmental cooperation in programming activities, to provide a clear delineation of the church's task in the quest for social justice, to insure the involvement of minority persons in ALC planning and programming activities, and to focus ALC concerns for social responsibility beyond the immediate crisis. In May and June attempts were made to lodge responsibility successively in a Council on Racial and Economic Justice within the Division of American Missions,[2] in a Standing Committee on Racial and Economic Justice responsible to the president and to the Church

---

[1] "Report of the Executive Director to the Commission on Research and Social Action" for meeting on October 14-15, 1968, p. 2.

[2] "Draft Proposal on Structure and Funds for Effective ALC Response to the Challenge of Racial and Economic Justice," prepared by Byron Schmid, May 24, 1968.

Council,[1] and in a permanent executive assistant to the president.[2] The Commission on Research and Social Action rejected the third proposal and requested the Church Council to expand the role of the Commission as a number of the executives had suggested.[3] But the Church Council reaffirmed its decision that the Commission continue as a resource unit in the church without program responsibilities.[4] In August an attempt was made to assign responsibility to a Department of Social Justice within the Division of Social Service.[5] Thereafter the drafts shifted away from an attempt to lodge program responsibility within one of the operating units of the church and focused instead upon the assignment of coordinating responsibility

---

[1] "Proposal on Structure and Funds for More Effective ALC Response to the Challenges of Racial and Economic Justice," prepared by Byron Schmid, May 29, 1968.

[2] "Proposal on Structure for More Effective ALC Response to the Challenge of Racial and Economic Justice," prepared by Byron Schmid, June 6, 1968.

[3] "Proposal on Structure for More Effective ALC Response to the Challenge of Racial and Social Justice," submitted June 17, 1968 by the Commission to the Church Council. The statement is Appendix C in Minutes of the Commission on Research and Social Action, June 17, 1968, p. 2.

[4] "Report of the Executive Director to the Commission on Research and Social Action" for meeting on October 14-15, 1968, pp. 1-2.

[5] This draft, the first entitled, "Decision in a Time of National Crisis," was a redraft and integration of the earlier Commission drafts, "The Challenge of the National Crisis" and "Proposal on Structure for More Effective Response to the Challenge of Racial and Social Justice." It was prepared in August 1968 by Byron Schmid and Carl Reuss. The rationale for the draft was articulated in "Introduction to Statement, 'Decision in a Time of National Crisis'," prepared by Byron Schmid, August 30, 1968.

XUM

first to the Commission on Research and Social Action[1] and then to a Coordinating Committee on the National Crisis composed of ALC executives.[2] The proposal for a coordinating committee was a modification of the Coordinating Committee on Urban Affairs, established by the Joint Council in June at the request of the Board of Social Service in order to provide coordination for the ALC.[3]

The General Convention endorsed the establishment of the coordinating committee, the Coordinating Committee on National Crises, but only after the General Convention Committee had reconsidered many of the proposals which had been rejected earlier.[4] The Coordinating Committee was directed to guide the response of the ALC to the problems of race, poverty, and injustice, including implementation of the programmatic objectives included in "Decision in a Time of National Crisis," and to disburse the Crisis Fund of $511,000 included in the 1969 budget. The name shift was made from "crisis" to "crises" in order to focus upon the many aspects of the crisis in American society. The General Convention also created an Advisory Council to assist the Coordinating Committee. The addition of the Advisory Council with its membership of four persons named by the Committee on Inner City Ministries and three persons by the Department of Specialized Ministries of the Division of American Missions guaranteed that minority persons would be related to the crisis program.

---

[1] "Decision in a Time of National Crisis," prepared by Carl Reuss and Byron Schmid in mid-September 1968.

[2] "Decision in a Time of National Crisis," prepared by Carl Reuss and Conrad Thompson after discussion with President Schiotz, October 3, 1968.

[3] The resolution from the Board of Social Service stated that "the present channels through which programs of divisions and commissions can be coordinated are cumbersome and largely of an 'unofficial' character and therefore concrete action is often hindered." It requested the Joint Council "to officially establish a coordinating committee which shall not only allocate funds but also coordinate the efforts of the various divisions and commissions of the church to meet the social crisis of our times." Minutes of the Board of Social Service, June 6-7, 1968, pp. 272-73. The action of the Joint Council was "to establish a coordinating committee for urban affairs to be responsible for allocating moneys from the urban crisis fund and for coordinating efforts of the ALC regarding urban affairs." Minutes of the Joint Council, June 27-29, 1968, p. 67.

[4] Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 495-97. The General Convention Committee finally removed the question of responsibility for implementation of the proposed statement, "Decision in a Time of National Crisis," and submitted it in a separate resolution to the General Convention. It accepted the coordinating

The difficulty involved in placing responsibility for racial and social justice efforts in the ALC stemmed from a number of factors. The lack of commitment to a planning process and the refusal of the president to provide effective coordination for the national offices, already described, were significant factors. For some persons "coordination" implied meddling with the prerogatives of individual departmental plans and concerns. For some there was fear that a coordinated effort would seek to become a "super" board of the church. Involved also were the interdepartmental jealousies which mitigated against placing the responsibility in an existing program division, lest one division increase in budget and staff at the expense

---

committee established by the Joint Council but renamed it the "Coordinating Committee for National Crises."

XUM

of other divisions. Finally it can be conjectured that, in spite of the February Church Council action and the resulting focus on the national crisis, many executives simply did not accord priority to national crisis action.

"Christ for Crises: Hope for All Seasons"

The 1968 General Convention of the ALC in October was very much aware of the winds of social change blowing across the face of America. Project Summer Hope had focused the church's attention on racial injustice. The disorders surrounding the Democratic National Convention in Chicago were fresh in the minds of all the delegates. The presidential campaign, the fear of white voter backlash, and frustration with the war in Vietnam were social realities. In this context the convention devoted three evenings to a consideration of race relations, the problems of rural America, and the concern of world hunger. The General Convention approved policy statements on interracial marriage,[1] Project Equality,[2] and world hunger[3] in addition to "Decision in a Time of National Crisis." The delegates also approved the creation of a budgetary category for crisis funds totalling more than $500,000. The only policy statements bitterly disputed concerned Vietnam[1] and selective conscientious objection.[2] A proposed statement on dissent and civil disobedience was not presented to the convention, due to uncertain reaction of the delegates in the fall of 1968.

---

[1] "Interracial Marriage."

[2] "Project Equality."

[3] "Hunger in the World."

Yet the future direction of the participation of the ALC national offices in the national crisis was not clear. The action of the Church Council in February and the development of Project Summer Hope had somewhat overshadowed the intention of the Commission on Evangelism for an evangelistic thrust throughout the church in 1969-70. But Conrad Thompson, executive director of the Commission on Evangelism, continued to lay plans for the emphasis, visualizing it as a corrective to what he feared might otherwise become a one-sided concern for social justice in the church.[3] His plan called for small retreat gatherings of pastors and laymen for the purpose of discussion Christian commitment and its meaning for social involvement.[4] In the eyes of many church executives, this approach was in itself not an adequate response to national problems; the program of the Commission on Evangelism, "Christ for Crises," was

---

[1] "Vietnam 1968."

[2] "Selective Conscientious Objection," Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 484-88.

[3] Interview with Conrad Thompson, July 22, 1969.

[4] Cf. "Christ for Crises: A Followup of Project Summer Hope, A Church-Wide Emphasis in Evangelism, 1968-70," prepared by Conrad Thompson for presentation to the Church Council in June, 1968.

XUM

simply not considered a viable follow-up to Project Summer Hope.[1] However, in June the evangelistic emphasis received the endorsement of the Church Council.[2] At the same meeting, the Church refused to consider an endorsement of the Kerner Commission recommendations as requested by the Commission on Research and Social Action.[3]

The efforts of the Commission on Research and Social Action to forge a long term ALC response to the needs of social justice and of the Commission on Evangelism to develop an emphasis on evangelism proceeded independently of each other and threatened to make it seem that the General Convention was adopting two separate church-wide emphases for the following year. In order to preclude this development, the president of the church met with Reuss and Thompson two weeks prior to the beginning of the General Convention and forced a combination of the themes. The disparity between the two programs, however,

---

1. It was surprising how little was known about the program, "Christ for Crises: Hope for All Seasons," by the ALC leadership in the summer of 1969, one year after its approval. Many expressed "hope" that something would result from the focus, but most expected few results. Inadequate planning and lack of coordination were the most frequently mentioned criticisms. Some viewed the program as another example of ALC "tokenism" in response to the national crisis. "Strategies for Mission," a focus on community involvement, was a later addition to the program and was not generally understood by the persons at the time of the interviews.

2. Minutes of the Church Council, June 24-26, 1968, pp. 33-34. The Church Council had given preliminary endorsement in February. Cf. Minutes of the Church Council, February 28-29, 1968, p. 8.

3. The proposed statement, "Endorsement of the Kerner Commission Recommendations," was merely "received as information." Minutes of the Church Council, June 24-26, 1968, p. 37.

amounted only to a merger in name. The social policy statement, "Decision in a Time of National Crisis," combined the themes in "Christ for Crises: Hope for All Seasons." By the time the General Convention had ended, the ALC had endorsed the evangelism emphasis, adopted programmatic objectives for social justice, created a crisis fund of $500,000, and established a coordinating committee to disburse the fund and to guide the follow-up to Project Summer Hope.

In the late spring of 1968 the departments engaged in social education had formed an interdepartmental committee, the Social Education Staff Group, to discuss plans for the coordination of future efforts.[1] Out of these efforts came the sponsorship of workshops on race and class consciousness for approximately 100 ALC staff in the national offices, the preparation of an annotated bibliography of materials on social problems for the October General Convention, additional impetus for an Augsburg Publishing House paperback series on social problems, and the production of a pamphlet on the various types of materials on social issues available to congregations.[2] The

---

1. Discussions for the formation of the interdepartmental staff group were begun in March 1968 between the staffs of the Commission on Research and Social Action and the Division of Parish Education. The group was organized on June 18, 1968, and included representatives from the Divisions of Parish Education, Social Service, Youth Activity, the Commissions on Research and Social Action and Evangelism, the Department of Stewardship, American Lutheran Church Men, and American Lutheran Church Women.

2. Resources for Social Concerns, prepared in June, 1969, by Byron Schmid.

latter was prepared as a resource for use by all the auxiliaries in 1970 as they centered their materials on current social problems.

The most significant contribution of the Social Education Staff Group, however, was the devising of a plan to serve as a follow-up to Project Summer Hope. Based upon earlier pilot experiments by the Division of Youth Activity, the church-wide project was designed to help congregations respond to community problems. Developed primarily by Robert Vogel, "Strategies for Mission" complemented the evangelism emphasis and built upon Project Summer Hope. "Strategies for Mission" was approved by the Coordinating Committee on National Crises in December, 1968, and a seven-member planning committee established, under the direction of Arnold Mickelson, the secretary of the church, to coordinate its implementation and the planning for the emphasis, "Christ for Crises: Hope for All Seasons."

The key to "Strategies for Mission" is the learning of a process for community involvement.[1] The plan encourages the formation of a congregational task force to analyze social needs in the community, establish priorities for response, determine objectives, and devise strategies for mobilizing the resources of the congregation for social change in the community. The task force is responsible (a) for the coordination of "discovery teams" whose function is to determine community needs and (b) for the leadership of a "decision conference" to choose priorities

---

[1] Cf. "Strategy for Mission," prepared by the Crisis/Hope Planning Committee, January, 1970.

XUM

plan strategy. The entire congregation is involved in the process. The responsibility of the ALC planning committee is to provide materials for the congregational task force and to train persons who can serve as resource persons in each district. Unlike the "crash" approach of Project Summer Hope and the "emphasis" approach of the Commission on Evangelism, "Strategies for Mission" seeks to help congregations learn a planning process for continued community involvement. In this respect it is a permanent follow-up to Project Summer Hope, mobilizing for action in the communities where the problems exist and where the people are.

A related development in the ALC has been the assumption of leadership for congregational social concerns by the Division of Social Service. Encouraged by the General Convention action both in 1966 and 1968,[1] the Board of Social Service in early 1969 created a Department of Congregational Social Concerns, engaging James Siefkes to provide staff services in the area. Much of his time is devoted to the implementation of the "Strategies for Mission" approach. Prior to this time no unit of the ALC had responsibility for social concerns in the life of congregations.

The work of the Coordinating Committee on National Crises began in November, 1968. Under the leadership of George Schultz, executive secretary for the Board of Trustees, the committee has devoted most of its efforts to disbursement of

---

[1] Reports and Actions, 1966, p. 434; Reports and Actions, 1968, p. 399.

XUM

the Crisis Fund.[1] At first, considerable time was spent developing analysis of the crisis, evaluating objectives, and establishing criteria for the evaluation of projects. Due to the existence of major differences of opinion between the Coordinating Committee and its Advisory Council, it was not until late spring that criteria for disbursements were mutually agreed upon by both groups.[2] In May, $270,000 of the Crisis Fund was specified for urban projects to be determined by special committees established in the metropolitan areas of the country. Another $80,000 was allocated for rural needs. The remaining $150,000 was allocated to projects submitted by ALC departments and other groups.[3] The Coordinating Committee also has instituted a procedure for evaluating all ALC departmental projects and programs related to social concerns.

---

[1] Interview with George Schultz, July 24, 1969, and Carl Reuss, July 9, 1969. Cf. "Report of Coordinating Committee on National Crises to Advisory Council on National Crises Covering Activities to May 14, 1969," prepared by Schultz, and included as Exhibit A in Minutes of Joint Meeting of Coordinating Committee for National Crises and Advisory Council on National Crises, May 14, 1969, p. 5.

[2] The Advisory Council on National Crises was comprised of inner city and rural clergy and laity, many of whom distrusted the executives on the Coordinating Committee on National Crises. Also some members of the Coordinating Committee wanted to use the Advisory Council only as a sounding board for ideas rather than as a joint policy-making body. The Advisory Council considerably enlarged its role over that which the Coordinating Committee had originally intended for it. Another source of frustration related to distribution of the Crises Fund. Many executives had expected that the fund would be divided among the divisions and commissions for programs to be operated by the separate units. The Advisory Council wanted the use of the funds to be determined and used by "grassroots" groups. While the final distribution of the funds was a compromise, nearly 70% of the total amount of the fund was turned over to the Advisory Council and to metropolitan area groups for decision and use.

[3] Minutes of the Joint Meeting of Coordinating Committee on National Crises and Advisory Council on National Crises, May 14, 1969, p. 5.

The ALC was again reminded of the angry voices of the inner city in June 1969 when the second Conference on Inner City Ministries was held with nearly 100 congregations represented. The conference turned its attention to the "Black Manifesto" and, while rejecting the ideology of the preamble, affirmed its call for reparations.[1] It demanded that the ALC provide its portion of the reparation and that $5 million over and above regular appropriations be allocated in the 1970 ALC budget to meet crisis needs. An evaluation of the response of the ALC departments to the resolutions adopted at the 1968 conference indicated that the departments had made little progress toward meeting the requests.[2] Delegates were bitterly disappointed that the ALC had not responded to their call for action responses in areas of housing, employment, poverty, policy-community relations, welfare, and education.

The endorsement by the conference of the Black Manifesto's call for reparations from the ALC put the Church Council, convening immediately after the inner city meeting for its regular annual session, on notice that the crisis climate within the country was a continuing challenge to the ALC. The Church

---

[1] Minutes of the National Conference of Inner City Ministry of the ALC, June 20, 22, 1969, pp. 26-29.

[2] "Report on Actions of ALC Divisions, Departments, and Commissions in Response to Referrals by Omaha Convention of 1968 CICM Resolutions."

XUM

Council repudiated the ideology of the preamble but recognized the "Manifesto" as a result "of the anguish and frustration in a segment of our society which feels the hopelessness of oppression and man's inhumanity to man." It directed that the entire Manifesto be sent to the congregations with the request that pastors and church councils study it and other materials in order to "become sensitive and responsive to the needs of minority groups where they live and work."[1] The idea of ALC reparations, however, was rejected.

The Church Council reaffirmed its February, 1968, confession of inadequate concern for minority and poverty problems and encouraged the national offices and congregations to continue to give priority to national crisis projects.[2] The Church Council also challenged members of the church "to assume political and economic leadership in developing programs and policies aimed at eliminating injustice and poverty in American society," called for an expansion of opportunities for conversation and leadership development with minorities throughout the church, encouraged congregations to undertake social action programs relating to minority needs, and requested the Commission on Research and Social Action to prepare a study on "law and order."

The Joint Council, meeting directly after the Church Council, asked the Board of American Missions to institute a sponsorship program whereby more affluent congregations could support particular programs in the inner city and in rural areas.[1] It also approved continuation of the Crisis Fund and designated that the ALC's tenth anniversary offering would be placed in the Crisis Fund with minority persons having "significant representation" in the group determining use of the fund. The appeal was expected to raise $1.5 million.[2] The Joint Council rejected an attempt to require as much financial support for crisis projects as for the establishment of new congregations, but it did curtail the funds requested by the Division of American Missions for new congregations.[3]

---

[1] Minutes of the Church Council, June 23-25, 1969, pp. 36-37.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 48-49.

The ALC Today

By the summer of 1969 it was still difficult to determine any overall response of the ALC to the national crisis. Project Summer Hope had alerted the church to the crisis as a priority concern of its mission. The General Convention had adopted programmatic objectives to guide the longer term response of the church, established a special crisis fund, and named a committee to coordinate the response and the expenditure of the crisis funds. In June of 1969 the Church Council and Joint Council reaffirmed the ALC's commitment to racial and social justice. However, the specific actions of the several national offices followed no clear pattern.

---

[1] The Joint Council Minutes do not record this action, but the question was referred by the Church Council to the Joint Council. Cf. Minutes of the Church Council, June 23-25, 1969, p. 49. The Pastoral Letter sent by President Schiotz to the pastors on July 11, 1969, credits the action to the Church Council.

[2] Minutes of the Joint Council, June 26-2 , 1969, p. 34.

[3] Ibid., p. 35. The Joint Council appropriated to the Division of American Mission funds to establish 26 new congregations in 1970. The Joint Council rejected an attempt to increase this number to 35 during the budget discussions. Interview with Arnold Thompson and R. Dale Lechleitner on December 4, 1969.

The work of the Division of Youth Activity continued in the direction of issue involvement and modular projects, a style of operation adopted in the early 1960's. The Commission on Research and Social Action, which had encouraged some of the earlier ALC crisis responses and had helped point the way toward longer term responses, turned its own attention to other matters. The women's auxiliary, the American Lutheran Church Women, seemed hardly aware of the national crisis throughout the entire period.[1] The American Lutheran Church Men, on the other hand, originated a new style of issue confrontation in a new publication at the end of 1969. The Division of College Education continued to fund the establishment of additional college centers for community renewal. The change in the investment policy of the Board of Trustees has already been noted.

The Division of American Missions continued to make priority readjustments in 1969. As indicated earlier, the division had for two or three years been rapidly increasing the proportion of its budget allocation for urban work and in the fall of 1968 adopted urban involvement as a policy priority. This shift in the division's previous policy was reaffirmed in

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 6, p. 207.

August, 1969, when the board adopted its "Declaration for the 70's," emphasizing the need to concentrate on people rather than buildings, indicating willingness to experiment with programs and structures, and anticipating decentralization of planning. The new policy also acknowledged the board's responsibility for social justice, "an emphasis that has not always been made in the past."[1] In other steps the entire staff of American Missions participated in an urban sensitivity training course at the Urban Training Center in Chicago in late 1968, an experience which the board also provided for the district presidents in November, 1969. Finally, American Missions through its Department of Specialized Ministries began a project in the San Joaquin Valley among the migrant workers in the summer of 1968.

The Division of Social Service, too, began a serious reexamination of its priorities in 1969. The budget of the division had remained near the one million dollar mark since the beginning of the ALC.[2] Most of the funds were used for grants to homes for the aged and children's homes, services to the mentally and physically handicapped as well as the deaf and blind, the support of chaplains and clinical training, and the assistance of inter-Lutheran social welfare agencies. In November, 1968, the board adopted a "Statement on Priorities"

---

[1] Minutes of the Board of American Missions, August 5-8, 1969, p. 6.

[2] In 1962 the Division of Social Service (then the Division of Charities) received $1,030,000 and in 1967, $1,148,000; Cf. Reports and Actions, 1962, p. 179, and Reports and Actions, 1968, p. 132.

XUM

urging social service agencies to reexamine all existing programs.[1] The policy statement noted that

> [i]n addition to direct personal services, helping to bring about social change through legislative and community involvement is a possibility. Programs of education on social issues for congregations and community are another. Well organized and trained volunteers can be an avenue for extending services beyond the agency's door as well as within it.
>
> In giving consideration to ways in which agencies and institutions meet human need, other resources in the community or the area need to be considered. The continuance of a service program of the church only because it is a traditional one, is no longer valid. If other agencies in the community, whether under state or private auspices, can assume certain responsibilities currently being carried out by agencies of the church and perhaps do a better job, the agency needs to reconsider whether it should continue in that service. One of the best functions of the church is to point the way, to pioneer, and to seek to meet concerns that no one else will touch.

The statement specifically listed legislative action as an important channel for community change. In September, 1969, a staff person was added to assist congregations in their community involvement. The board also initiated a study of its grant program, seeking to shift away from annual subsidy grants to the regular operating budgets of social service agencies to a system of grants designed to induce the agencies to redirect their programs toward more community action.[2]

The publications of the Division of Parish Education and Augsburg Publishing House also began to reflect a consciousness of the national crisis. One of the first steps of the Division of Parish Education was to enlist the services of black consultants to review the parish education materials.[1] In June, 1968, the board instructed its staff to include a greater awareness of racism and the urban crisis in future curriculum, to plan the curriculum for use in the inner city as well as the suburbs, and to produce several units of the curriculum especially oriented toward the inner city.[2] As a result of these decisions, the materials for vacation church schools in 1970 will consider problems of human relations and the urban community.[3] A new inter-Lutheran adult study resource, Men of Color, Men of Faith, will be available in the fall of 1970. In addition, the Division of Parish Education in teacher training sessions has discussed the effect of attitudes of superiority and rejection upon students in the classroom.[4]

---

[1] Minutes of the Board of Social Service, November 11-12, 1968, p. 285.

[2] Interview with Paul Boe, executive director of the Division of Social Service, October 2, 1969.

Some progress has been made by the national offices in reflecting the programmatic objectives approved by the 1968 General Convention in their activities. Supportive services to the congregations and the inner city church have been increased, additional information on projects and innovative

---

1. Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Board of Parish Education, March 11, 1968, pp. 476-77.

2. Minutes of the Board of Parish Education, June 6, 1968, pp. 489-90.

3. Cf. "Augsburg Publishing House and Minority Persons," prepared by Albert Anderson, October 22, 1969.

4. Interview with C. Richard Evenson, executive director of the Division of Parish Education, July 15, 1969.

programs in the area of social justice has been distributed to the congregations,[1] investment funds of the Board of Trustees have been shifted to activities of benefit to minority communities, and the Division of American Missions has increased its attention to the development of programs and services vis-a-vis facilities.

On the other hand, many of the programmatic objectives remain unfulfilled. The ALC has not launched "an intensive education effort" on the heritage of minority groups and the nature of racism and poverty as prescribed in the policy statement, "Decision in a Time of National Crisis." While minority persons are involved on the Advisory Council to the Coordinating Committee on National Crises, the Committee on Specialized Ministries in the Division of American Missions, and as consultants in other capacities, they still have not been placed on the policy-making boards and commissions of the church, except for one black layman on the Church Council. The national offices employ one black executive staff person. Nor has the ALC through its Commission on Research and Social Action or the Church Council championed political action in the areas of housing, employment, education, welfare, health, and police and law enforcement practices. While Project Equality has received the endorsement of the General Convention and the ALC has contributed $5,000 to the national office of Project Equality, the program still has not been implemented by the Board of Trustees.[1] As a national church the ALC is not generally committed to staff and financial support of community action programs. Nor has the national church increased its support for minority education programs. Increased scholarship funds for black students have been provided at the ALC seminaries, however.[2] But only the Division of American Missions and the Board of Trustees have significantly shifted their departmental priorities to reflect a genuine response to the national crisis. The Division of Social Service now is beginning to effect comparable priority changes.

---

[1] The "Christ for Crises: Hope for All Seasons" Planning Committee has distributed to the congregations descriptions of social action projects undertaken by several local church groups. Mailings of these projects, entitled "Grassroots" were made in June and December, 1969.

The ALC, the National Crisis, and Public Policy

This chapter has portrayed the activity of the national offices and leadership of the ALC in response to the national racial crisis in the late 1960's. Political activity has been very limited and somewhat ambiguous. The policy statement, "Decision in a time of National Crisis," adopted at the 1968 General Convention, directed stronger ALC efforts to influence

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 5, p. 152.

[2] The Board of College Education had requested appropriations in order to provide $120,000 for minority scholarships. Cf. Minutes of the Board of College Education, March 10-11, 1969, pp. 14-15. The Joint Council, however, did not authorize the additional funds. Interview with Clifford Johnson, October 22, 1969.

XUM

public policy: however, the statement remains essentially unimplemented. The Commission on Research and Social Action endorsed the recommendations of the Kerner Commission; yet the Church Council refused to act on the statement. The Detroit letter and the Conference of Inner City Clergy and Laity urged ALC commitment to action projects, including legislative activity, to promote social justice; yet to this date responsibility has not been assigned to any ALC division for this concern. The Division of Social Service in its "Statement of Priorities" encouraged social service agencies and districts to engage in community and political action: but the division itself has no authority to act accordingly at the national level. Project Summer Hope had as one of its objectives encouragement and support for political responses for the crisis: but the implementation of the project avoided such efforts. Project Equality was endorsed by the 1968 General Convention; but it has not been implemented by the Board of Trustees. Moreover, the Church Council urged pastors not to mention the name of the institution that employs them when they endorse political candidates.

What seems to emerge is the picture of an institution struggling with the nature of its role in society and, in particular, its political responsibility. The above changes indicate thrusts toward increased political awareness and activity: yet they also reveal considerable caution and reluctance to effect the changes once policy for change has been formulated. The adequacy of the ALC stance of limited political involvement, outlined in Chapter V, is receiving strong challenge from critical national problems today. A new political awareness is emerging: a corporate political role for the church is beginning to appear. But the current pattern of ALC activity still strongly reflects a basic commitment to individual action to effect changes in public policy.

The fundamental problem for the ALC stems from its uncertainty as to how it should define its responsibility for social justice. Involved in this problem of course are questions of the proper forms of direct political activity and the use of the corporate power of the church in politics as well as fear of a conservative budgetary backlash over the church's social involvement. The ambiguity and difficulty over the assignment of responsibility for social justice, the placement of minority persons on decision-making boards, the implementation of the programmatic objectives adopted in "Decision in a Time of National Crisis," the readjustment of division and commission priorities to incorporate the concerns of social justice, all portray the current ALC struggle with the basic problem. The situation is further complicated by insufficient coordinating leadership from the office of the president and by the lack of a sound planning process by which the ALC can develop strategy to implement carefully defined objectives.

The response of the ALC to the national crisis has created a new awareness about the responsibility of the church for social concerns. This new awareness, largely traceable to Project Summer Hope, and changes in some of the policy boards of the church, especially the Boards of Trustees and American

XUM

Missions, have generated forces which will likely press for even more change in the future. The current limits which the ALC leadership has placed around ALC efforts for social justice and public policy are slowly but steadily being expanded. Gradually the ALC is assuming an increased responsibility for the social order.

Chapter VIII

THE USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF ALC SOCIAL POLICY STATEMENTS

Confronted by the same social issues and problems that face any other institution in society, the American Lutheran Church periodically addresses selected issues through social policy statements. Since its beginning in 1961, the ALC has adopted policy statements on several issues. This chapter examines the functions of social policy statements, their official status within the ALC, the process by which the ALC develops statements, and the ways in which the church uses its social policy statements, especially with respect to communications with government officials. The next chapter will examine the political thought expressed in these statements.

The Status of ALC Social Policy Statements

As indicated in Chapter V, in the ALC social policy statements which are intended to address the general public and public agencies must be first approved by the Church Council or the General Convention.[1] When adopted by either body,

---

[1] Cf. p. 127.

XUM

social statements become "official" pronouncements of the ALC. Usually such policy statements are addressed primarily to the membership but also may be communicated to the general public and to government officials. Statements which are issued only by the Commission on Research and Social Action or any other division or commission of the church are not recognized as position statements of the entire church.

However, the Commission on Research and Social Action has been given authority to address the membership of the church on social, economic, political matters without the prior approval of the Church Council. The Commission accomplishes this internal communication by drafting preliminary or proposed policy statements and circulating them within the church in order "to stimulate thinking and promote discussion."[1] The preliminary statements are revised in the light of comments made by the membership, and usually submitted to the Church Council and General Convention for consideration. The Commission seeks to avoid having its statements considered as ALC positions or even as official positions of the Commission.

By treating its statements as preliminary rather than final positions, the Commission has avoided the sharp criticism and intense reaction that frequently accrues to an organization

---

[1] The Commission invariably identifies its statements as proposed General Convention statements and indicates their use "to stimulate thinking and promote discussion" within the church. "Stimulate thinking and promote discussion" is taken from one of the Commission's constitutional directives: "Prepare studies and evaluations of pertinent social problems and issues in order to stimulate thinking and promote discussion within the Church . . . ." The Constitution and By-Laws of the ALC, op. cit., 1440.3, p. 92.

XUM

which formulates policy positions on debatable issues. In a real sense, though, statements circulated in the church for preliminary consideration have received the endorsement of the Commission and are therefore Commission policy statements. It should be noted that the Commission practice regarding its positions as "proposed" social statements is not a practice dictated by the policies and procedures which the Church Council has adopted to guide the Commission's work. For example, the Commission could, if it so chose, adopt social statements in its own name and address them _to_ the ALC and its members in order to "stimulate thinking and promote discussion."[1]

This and the following chapter regards as policy statements of the ALC all social positions which have been adopted by divisions and commissions as well as by the Church Council and General Convention since 1961. While only Church Council- or General Convention-adopted statements have "official" standing for the ALC, statements adopted by the Commission on Research and Social Action or any other unit of the church also are quasi-official in that they express the considered collective judgment of a recognized unit of the church.

Since 1961 the ALC has adopted 75 social policy

---

[1] The Constitution specifies that statements proposed for release to government and to other public agencies as well as statements issued "for the policy guidance of the Church" must be approved by the Church Council. Cf. _The Constitution and By-Laws of the ALC_, _op. cit._, 1440.3a and c. The latter requirement would seem only to prohibit the Commission from adopting statements similar to "Decision in a Time of National Crisis," which calls upon the church for specific action program, without prior approval of the Church Council.

XUM

statements.[1] Thirty-four of these statements, or 45.2% of the total, have been adopted by the four General Conventions; 26, or 34.7%, are expressions of the Church Council, including one by the Joint Council; 12, or 16%, are statements of the Commission on Research and Social Action; and three, or four percent, are positions of the Board of Social Service. Fifteen of the 75 statements received the endorsement of the Commission on Research and Social Action, the Church Council, and the General Convention. According to the Constitution of the ALC, 60 of the 75 statements, or 80%, are "official" positions of the church.

ALC policy statements include those positions which have been "commended for study" as well as those which have been "adopted." The two terms signify only a degree of difference with respect to their status within the ALC. Technically "commended for study" indicates preliminary approval of a statement that merits consideration within the church while "adopted" indicates final action. All "commended for study" statements, however, have reflected the thinking of the approving group. Of the 34 statements considered by the General Convention, 27 have been adopted and seven have been commended for study.[2] Twenty-one of the Church Council statements have been adopted and five have been commended for study. All but one of the statements approved by the Commission on Research and Social

---

[1] Appendix, Table 1, Parts I-II, pp. 341-53.

[2] *Ibid.*, Part II.

XUM

Action have been commended for study. The single exception was an opinion expressed by the Commission.

ALC social policy statements do not bind the members of the church except insofar as the members are convinced by the inherent merits of a position. The assent of the members is gained by the weight of what is said. This is true even of statements adopted by the General Convention. At the same time, because positions have been adopted by persons recognized by the members through election to the policy units of the church, it is expected that the positions will merit respect and serious consideration even from those who disagree with their content.

Functions of ALC Social Policy Statements

ALC social policy statements generally serve one or more of five basic functions.[1] They orient church members to particular problems, they state what the endorsing unit believes public policy should be on the matter, they attempt to shape the conscience of church members, they serve as a petition to the unit of government concerned, and they formally establish church policy. A majority of the ALC statements serve the first three functions, and many have established church policy. Only a few have served as petitions.

---

[1] This writer is indebted to Dieter Hessel of the Office of Church and Society, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., for suggesting these functions. Cf. Reconciliation and Conflict, op. cit., pp. 111ff.

One of the primary functions of the statements is orientation of members to a particular problem or issue. Most ALC statements formulated by the Commission on Research and Social Action attempt to define problems, provide careful social analysis of causes, and consider probable consequences of proposed action or inaction. Most statements which originate in the Church Council or the General Convention, on the other hand, lack the input of informed consultants and the time for adequate consideration and thus have a tendency to be "thrown together." The statement on federal tax deductibility of church contributions, for example, adopted by the Church Council in 1963, contained erroneous information and had to be revised just prior to its submission at a congressional hearing.[1]

A good illustration of the problem-oriented function of church policy statements can be seen in the position, "The Grape Controversy," approved by the Commission on Research and Social Action and the Church Council in 1969 for study and discussion in the congregations. Excepting the introductory and concluding paragraphs, four of the nine paragraphs, or about 800 words, deal with a description of the California grape strike in the setting of the general problem of American agriculture. The purpose of this and descriptions of problems in other statements is to provide a background of factual information to help inform the members of the church about the problem as well as to stress the importance of an accurate understanding of an issue as a prerequisite to responsible action.

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 5, p. 150.

Closely related to the function of orienting to the problem is the articulation of broad social policy goals. Almost all of the social policy statements of the ALC serve this function, including those positions adopted by the Church Council and the General Convention without the prior consideration of the Commission on Research and Social Action. The articulation of policy goals points the membership in the direction of a desired social change. Goals outline the direction of social policy and suggest criteria to guide the development of particular answers to problems without attempting to propose specific solutions. Social policy goals seek to build a consensus on approaches to problems without which political action becomes exceedingly difficult.

Social policy goals are "middle axioms," a term coined by J. H. Oldham at the 1937 Oxford Conference on Church, Community, and Society. Oldham claimed the middle-ranged principles "attempt to define the directions in which, in a particular state of society, Christian faith must express itself. They are not binding for all time but are provisional definitions of the type of behavior required of Christians at a given period and in given circumstances."[1] "Middle-axioms" are more concrete than universal ethical principles but less specific than programs that include legislation and political strategy.[1] They focus the attention of church members upon practical social goals, leaving to members the responsibility for determining the best means to express them.

---

[1] Visser't Hooft and J. H. Oldham, The Church and Its Function in Society (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1937), p. 210.

Again the statement, "The Grape Controversy," illustrates the emphasis on social policy goals by the ALC:

> 9. With respect to the workers, we favor: (1) legal recognition of the right of farm workers to organize and to bargain collectively under the protections of appropriate federal legislation; (2) educational and retraining opportunities for farm workers to equip them for other agricultural or for non-agricultural employment; and (3) advocacy assistance to them in their participation in the economic, social, and political communities in which they live or work.
>
> 10. In efforts to deal with the plight of the small growers, we favor: (1) wider recognition of major changes in agricultural technology and the size of economic units, including the possibility of expanding the cooperative movement among small growers; (2) tax reforms which end preferential protections to certain types of farm owners not directly or primarily involved in agricultural production; and (3) legal recognition of efforts by the growers to set fair and equitable prices for agricultural commodities which compensate the producers justly for their time, management skills, and capital investment.

The task of political action is to determine how these goals can best be expressed. The goals seek to suggest a framework within which political strategy should move, but leave to each member the freedom to work for the implementation of appropriate and effective means. The statement, "Endorsement of Kerner Commission Recommendations," is another example of the church supporting specific social goals, without suggesting the particular means for their accomplishment.

---

[1] Bennett, Christian Ethics and Social Policy, op. cit., p. 77.

There are times, however, when the statement of social policy goals becomes even more specific than "middle-axioms." The statement on "Abortion and the Law" calls for the eventual abolition of all abortion statutes and the position on "The Death Penalty" calls for a ten-year moratorium on the exercise of capital punishment, leading to eventual prohibition of its use. The statements adopted by the Church Council generally are of this more specific nature, expressing positions on particular matters and calling for specific action.

A third important function of church policy statements is an appeal to the church members' sense of moral obligation, the formation of conscience. Here the church seeks to arouse the members to participate in the struggle against injustice and for civic betterment on the basis of the expressed purpose of the church. The effort is made to relate the Christian commitment to the expression of social policy goals and political and social involvement.

Probably the most dramatic exercise of this function in the ALC followed the adoption of the resolution by the Church Council in early 1968 wherein it acknowledged "the shortcomings of our church in the area of social concerns and our insensitivity to the minority and poverty problems of our nation. . . ."[1] Project Summer Hope and other efforts of the ALC in response to the national crisis stemmed from this initial action."[2] The statement on "Interracial Marriage" affirms the position that Christian faith does not oppose marriages across racial lines. The thrust of "Christians in Politics" is to urge church members to engage actively in the political process. "Public Authority, Dissent, and Civil Disobedience" discusses the exercise and the limits of dissent and civil disobedience in a democratic society, suggesting criteria for responsible protest. These and other ALC policy statements help shape the norms and values, the social conscience, of the members of the church for their active participation in civic life.

---

[1] "The National Crisis and the ALC" (1968).

[2] Cf. Chapter 7.

Social policy statements also allow communication with government. As a national religious organization, such ALC communications refer to contacts with the federal government. An examination of ALC statements, shows that most enunciate broad social policy goals without supporting or opposing specific government actions. In fact, only 21 positions, or 28% of all statements, even contain a reference to government policy.[1] Of these nine, or 12% of the statements, petitioned or supported the government on a particular issue, seven endorsed specific policy without reference to a particular agency of government, and four statements commended previous government action. One statement simply stated the pros and cons of an issue and requested members to indicate their preference directly to their Senators. Most of the calls for direct communication with the government concerned either questions of church-state relations or matters with particular advantage to the church or its members. Only two of the nine statements excluded concerns of the church's own self-interest and both originated at the General Conventions of the church.[1]

---

[1] Appendix, Table 1, Part VII, pp. 341-53.

A final function which social policy statements serve is the establishment of church policy. Statements not only urge church members to become active in specific ways; they also direct the corporate church and its units to proceed with specific programs or responsibilities. Thirty-five, or 46.7%, of the social policy statements have provided policy guidance for the ALC.[2] Examples of such statements are "Decision in a Time of National Crisis," mentioned in Chapter VII; "The Church as Employer," which calls upon the church to be an exemplary employer; "Project Equality," which directs the church to use its purchasing power in the service of equal employment opportunity; "Federal Aid to Church Institution," which provides guidelines for church reception of federal funds; and "Effective Ministry in Intercultural Communities," which directs all congregations and units of the church to practice an inclusive ministry in the community.

---

[1] "Support for President Kennedy in Cuban Crisis" (1962) and "International Aid and Development" (1968).

[2] Appendix, Table 1, Part VI, pp. 341-53.

The Development of ALC Social Policy Statements[1]

The major sources of social policy statements in the ALC are the Commission on Research and Social Action, the Church Council, and the General Convention. As indicated earlier, 72 of the 75 statements have been acted upon by one or more of these three units. In all, the General Conventions of the church have adopted 34 position statements, 19 of them on referral from the Church Council, including two from the Joint Council, and three directly from the Commission on Research and Social Action.[2] Twelve statements originated at the General Conventions. Fifteen of the 19 statements referred to the General Convention by the Church Council had initially been prepared by the Commission on Research and Social Action. Since 1961 the Church Council has adopted a total of 45 statements, 24 of them originating with the Commission, one with the Board of Pensions, and the remaining 20 with the Church Council itself. Included in this latter number are three statements acted on by the Joint Council and four referred by the National Lutheran Church. Nineteen of the 45 statements adopted by the Church Council have subsequently been adopted by the General

---

[1] Much of the information in this and in the succeeding section of the chapter is based upon the writer's working knowledge of the development and use of social policy statements in the ALC.

[2] Appendix, Table 1, Part II, pp. 341-53.

Convention. The Commission on Research and Social Action has adopted a total of 39 policy statements, 24 of them subsequently adopted by the Church Council. Eighteen of the Commission's positions have eventually been endorsed by General Conventions.

The determination of the subjects of policy statements varied with the units. The Commission on Research and Social Action has developed statements at the request of the Church Council, some of which have been "memorialized," or requested, by district conventions; at the urging of district committees on social action; at the suggestion of the Commission staff; or by decision of the Commission itself. Church Council statements stemmed from the request of the president of the church or by decision of the Church Council. The General Convention acted on the statements referred to it by the Church Council through the Joint Council, most of which were prepared by the Commission on Research and Social Action, or on resolutions presented by delegates or by the General Convention Committee.

Choices of topics and priorities of subjects have usually been determined without the assistance of a systematic selection process. Topics have been selected apart from a well-established review process which determined the critical needs of church and society and selected topics on a scale of priorities. The Church Council and the General Convention, of course, were not expected to serve in this manner, and the Commission on Research and Social Action has really never established such a planning and review process. In general, the Commission on Research and Social Action has accepted the requests of the Church Council and the recommendations of its

XUM

executive director on topical needs, and the Church Council has responded to the requests of President Schiotz. Topical needs have never been broadly reviewed even within the Commission staff.

Most of the social policy statements which have been considered by the Commission on Research and Social Action have been drafted by its executive director, Carl Reuss. A limited number have been drafted by other Commission staff or Commission members, or have originated with district committees. Only in a very few instances have drafts been written by task forces or committees composed of persons especially knowledgeable in the subject of the proposed statement, although occasionally Reuss has asked such persons for their individual comments on a draft. Indeed, only in a very few instances have drafts prepared by Commission staff even been reviewed by other Commission staff prior to submission to the Commission.

Statement drafts are examined by the Commission on nine members.[1] The Commission has considered the drafts sentence-by-sentence, following which the revised drafts are generally circulated to the district social action committees for review and comment. More than two-thirds of the Commission's 39 positions were reviewed by the district committees, including 14 of the 15 statements which the General Convention eventually adopted on the recommendation of the Church Council.[1] The district review process subjects proposed statements to critical examination by approximately 125 pastors and laymen in the 18 districts of the church. After district review, the proposed statements are again revised by the Commission staff and members and endorsed for consideration by the Church Council and possible General Convention action.

---

[1] The members of the Commission are socially-sensitive individuals, but tend to represent only one age strata in the ALC. For example, the average age of the members is 57. No member is younger than 49 years and women, youth, and minorities are noticeably absent. In 1968, the Church Council did authorize two youths to attend the meetings, but they have only advisory status. Thus the composition of the Commission reflects another weakness in the ALC's process for considering the problems of church and society.

In the past few years a number of proposed statements also have been circulated widely through the church. These are sent to the pastors in the monthly mailing from the national offices. Copies are then ordered from the Commission, without cost, for use in study groups in the congregations. More than a dozen preliminary statements have been circulated in this way within the past three years, many of them in cooperation with the Division of Parish Education in the "Operation Speak-Up" series. Preliminary statements circulated throughout the church generally bring in a dozen or so responses which are considered when the proposed statement is revised by the Commission.[2]

The above process used by the Commission on Research and Social Action stands in rather sharp contrast to the process developed by the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and by the United Church of Christ. The unit in the United Presbyterian Church comparable to the Commission on Research and Social Action is the Counseling Committee on Church and Society.[1] The Counseling Committee, however, is aided by an advisory committee of 15 members who study the issues, prepare background papers, and write draft resolutions. The preliminary work on the social policy statements, called "pronouncements" in the Reformed tradition, is done in five advisory groups (international affairs, economic life, community problems, metropolitan society, and race relations), each of which includes experts as regular or coopted members. The United Church of Christ utilizes a similar process. In 1969 its proposed statements received as many as 350 responses from church groups and individuals during the review process.[2]

---

[1] Interview with Carl Reuss, July 9, 1969.

[2] *Ibid.*

In evaluating the process used by the ALC's Commission on Research and Social Action, the strongest feature of that process seems to have been the involvement of district committees in the review process, thus insuring "grassroots" reaction to proposed statements prior to their final adoption. On the other hand, the major weakness of the Commission's manner of operation has been its failure to include persons knowledgeable in the subject areas in the process of selecting and drafting statements. From time to time comments are solicited from selected expert individuals, but such persons are not regularly involved in the work of the Commission.[1]

---

[1] "By Way of Introduction," Social Progress, July/August, 1967, pp. 3-4.

[2] "The Pre-Synod Study Process," Social Action, September, 1969, pp. 43-46. Cf. Ray Gibbons, "Processing a Pronouncement," Social Action, September, 1967, pp. 6-9.

When the Commission on Research and Social Action has concluded its consideration of a proposed statement, the latter is generally forwarded to the Church Council for action. As noted previously, 24 of the Commission's 39 statements have been advanced to the Church Council. At least six other statements will be presented to the Church Council in the summer of 1970. Most of the remaining statements include positions adopted for limited circulation in the church, policy directives for social action, and a few statements which never reached the stage of final adoption.

The Church Council passes judgment upon the Commission's statements and approves those which are intended as positions of the ALC to the non-ALC public. The Church Council generally endorses the Commission's positions without amendment, although the Church Council has amended some of the statements and at times has referred proposed statements back to the Commission for further review. Since 1961 the Church Council has amended eight of the 24 statements presented to it by the Commission,

---

1. Many of these persons have expressed to this writer their bewilderment over the Commission's failure to utilize their services. It is this writer's observation that the Commission is willing to include expert persons in its work on a regular basis, but that the executive director fears the development of a process which will remove the sole drafting responsibility from himself. He welcomes views sharply divergent from his own up to the point where the expression of such views may replace his own positions on issues.

all of the amendments being relatively minor in nature.[1] In 1965 the Church Council authorized the Executive Committee of the Commission to file its dissent with the Joint Council for referral to the General Convention along with the Church Council changes, should substantive changes be made in the Commission text with which the executive director and two members of the Commission did not agree.[2] The Commission to date has not considered such action necessary, however.

The Church Council generally has devoted very little time to the statements prepared by the Commission. The usual practice is for an *ad hoc* review committee of the Church Council to examine the report of the Commission and to recommend Church Council action on the report. The social policy statements of the Church Council which do not come from the Commission are drafted either by *ad hoc* committees of the Church Council or by other agencies of the church, such as the former National Lutheran Council or the Theological Council.[3] A few Church Council statements have merely been brief resolutions on specific questions. Needless to say, the Church Council neither has the time nor the expertise necessary to develop carefully-prepared statements. It was primarily for this reason that the Commission on Research and Social Action challenged the Church Council practice of adopting social policy statements without the benefit of Commission in 1963.[1]

---

[1] Appendix, Table 1, Part V, pp. 341-53.

[2] Minutes of the Church Council, July 2-5, 1965, p. 36.

[3] The Theological Council is composed of seminary professors who have the responsibility of advising the Church Council on theological questions. The Church Council has referred a few social questions to the Theological Council for its recommendations.

The policy statements which the Church Council endorsed for consideration by the General Convention, including those presented to the Church Council by the Commission on Research and Social Action, are referred to the General Convention through the Joint Council. The Joint Council has considered only three social statements which have not received prior approval from the Church Council. One was a statement referred by the National Lutheran Council,[2] another was a position formulated by an ad hoc committee established by the Church Council,[3] and the third was a question submitted to it by the Board of Social Service.[4] The first two statements were submitted by the Joint Council to the General Convention.

Social policy statements which are to be considered by the General Convention are printed in the Pre-Convention Report and mailed to the approximately 1,000 delegates, one-half clergy and one-half lay, one month in advance of the convention. Eighteen of the 34 statements adopted by General Conventions

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 5, p.

[2] "Compulsory Attendance at Worship Services at Military Academies" (1964).

[3] "Federal Aid for Church Institutions" (1962).

[4] "State Use of Chaplaincy Services" (1969).

XUM

have been transmitted in this manner.[1] The intention, of course, is that delegates will familiarize themselves with the proposed statements in preparation for voting at the General Convention. Beginning with the 1968 General Convention, the Commission on Research and Social Action also has been allowed to prepare social policy positions just prior to the General Convention. This change was authorized following sharp criticism of the Commission for failure to have resolutions on a number of current issues ready at the 1966 General Convention. The Commission had been handicapped, however, by the requirement that any resolutions it planned to submit to the General Convention had to be considered by the Church Council. This meant that no Commission statements could be prepared in the five months prior to the meeting of the General Convention. With the change adopted in 1967 the Commission now has the authority to transmit statements to the General Convention through the General Convention Committee. Three statements were channelled through this route in 1968.[2]

At the General Convention the proposed social policy statements are discussed by one of five Convention review groups, established to examine the report of the divisions, commissions, and auxiliaries. The preliminary position statement are thus discussed for two hours by approximately 200 persons prior to floor debate. The Convention schedule generally shows for less than one and one-half hours for the consideration of all matters by the Commission, although additional time is usually required for debate on the social positions.[1]

---

[1] Appendix, Table 1, Part II, pp.

[2] "Decision in a Time of National Crisis" (1968), "Vietnam 1968" (1968), and "Selective Conscientious Objection." Only a portion of the latter statement was adopted. Cf. "Pastoral Counsel for Selective Conscientious Objectors" (1968).

The present General Convention schedule is woefully inadequate for responsible consideration of major social policy statements by the ALC. Most delegates have little information about the proposed statements, little time is available at the General Convention for informed discussion, and the president of the church has prevented the Commission on Research and Social Action from having its positions presented by persons expert in the subject matters of the statements. In contrast the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. has a Standing Committee on Church and Society which, in 1967, devoted more than 27 hours to a consideration of proposed social pronouncements.[2] In addition the General Assembly debated the pronouncements for more than five hours. Similarly, the Report Committee on Pronouncements at the General Synod of the United Church of Christ devoted the major portion of two days to a

---

[1] At the 1968 General Convention the president of the church called for discussion of Commission statements whenever time was available on the schedule. As a result the Commission staff and chairman were asked to the podium a number of times. The arbitrary and sporadic scheduling of discussion on social policy statements created considerable confusion as to when statements would be discussed and in what order. The procedure was certainly not conducive to serious and informed debate.

[2] "By Way of Introduction," Social Progress, op. cit.

XUM

discussion of proposed pronouncements.[1]

Twenty-two of the 34 General Convention statements have been prepared by the Commission on Research and Social Action and/or the Church or Joint Council.[2] The remaining 12 positions were drafted at the General Conventions, most of them in the form of brief resolutions. Generally these resolutions have been introduced by interested individuals and were accepted with little if any discussion. While they stand as official policy statements of the ALC, they have been accorded little recognition in the church. Usually they have received only the recognition of being printed in the official report of the General Conventions, Reports and Actions.

The Use of ALC Social Policy Statements, With Special Reference to Public Officials

ALC social policy statements have received their greatest use as educational tools within the church. Usually this has occurred during the stage of policy development when preliminary statements are reviewed by pastors and by study groups, many of whom report their reactions to the Commission on Research and Social Action. The Commission in turn considers these comments when the statements are revised. As indicated earlier, the Commission has increased its printing and circulation of proposed statements in the past few years. In this regard, the

---

[1] "Processing a Statement," Social Action, op. cit., p. 8.

[2] Appendix, Table 1, Part II, pp.

Commission has sometimes cooperated with the Division of Parish Education in the printing and distribution of preliminary statements along with study questions and a study guide. At the present time most of the statements which will be considered at the 1970 General Convention are being studied in their preliminary form throughout the church.

Many of the statements also are printed in quantity by the Commission following their adoption by the Ceneral Convention. All of the major policy statements adopted by General Conventions are available in quantity printing. The resolutions framed at the General Conventions are printed only in the Reports and Actions and are read only by a limited number of persons. A number of other policy statements adopted by the Commission on Research and Social Action and the Church Council are available in mimeographed form upon request. At the end of 1969, 34 social policy statements were available in quantity.[1] In addition, eight other statements had been distributed to all the pastors of the church at one time or another. Since 1961 nearly 2.1 million copies of preliminary and final statements have been circulated in the church.[2]

During the past nine years one-third of the social policy statements have been communicated to one or more units of the federal government.[1] These have included 19 General Convention statements, five Church Council positions, and one position endorsed by the Commission on Research and Social Action. Thirteen positions have been communicated to the President or some department of the executive branch of government, 14 have been distributed to selected members of the Congress, and five have been entered as testimony in congressional hearings. A few of the positions have been communicated to more than one unit of government. A considerable number of the ALC positions have been communicated to government officials through the Washington Office of Public Affairs of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., or its predecessor, at the request of Carl Reuss, executive director of the ALC's Commission on Research and Social Action. In some instances the president or the secretary of the church has communicated the ALC stands.

---

[1] Ibid., Part IX.

[2] Ibid.

Beyond the distribution of these statements to government officials, the ALC has utilized almost no other political action methods to advance the positions it has adopted. As noted above, only five positions have been entered into congressional hearings. Consistent with the political role which the ALC has defined for itself, described in Chapter V, the church constantly encourages its members to communicate to their congressmen. However, the ALC has not developed any overall strategy for effecting such individual communication.

---

[1] Ibid., Part VIII. The information on the communication of policy statements was provided by the offices of the president and secretary of the ALC and by Carl Reuss, executive director of the Commission on Research and Social Action.

The next chapter examines the political thought expressed in the social policy statements of the ALC.

Chapter IX

POLITICAL THOUGHT IN ALC SOCIAL POLICY STATEMENTS

Although only a little over one-fourth of the ALC social policy statements refer to government policy, as indicated in the previous chapter, most of them express a definable political philosophy. This chapter examines the political and social thought of social policy statements of the ALC insofar as such thought elucidates the church's attitudes toward public policy.

Statements in the current chapter are classified for convenience in one of six major areas: citizenship and political rights, family life and health, church-state relations, social and economic life, race relations, and international affairs. The statements which express the ALC's understanding of its corporate political role were considered in Chapter V.

Citizenship and Political Rights

The central document setting forth the ALC's position on citizenship is "Christians in Politics," adopted by the 1966 General Convention. The statement holds that Christians "inescapably are involved in politics." The latter term is defined as "the way in which power is organized, conflict is controlled,

XUM

public policy is developed." Politics "is simply the process of community decision-making" which, the statement claims, "is necessary and wholesome part of man's civic life, under God's sustaining hand." The position rejects the view that politics is antithetical to Christian faith and instead emphasizes that "as citizens Christian people share responsibility for governmental decisions and public policies," even when they "remain silent or do nothing." Accordingly, Christians are encouraged to participate actively in political parties, beginning at the precinct level, and in civic action committees. The statement overlooks the role of private interest groups, however, when it indicates that politics is exercised "largely" through political parties and non-partisan civic action groups.

"Christians in Politics" elevates "the well-being of the total community" as the goal for Christians in political life. Political power, it notes, should not be used to advance the interests of any church organization and political differences within a church should be recognized and respected. Compromise is viewed as "an inevitable part of the give and take of politics" which "involves the process of achieving a meeting of the minds, an acceptable consensus, a workable reconciliation of conflict or of diverse views." As such it accepts "the possible as a step toward the desirable."

The statement recognizes that the political involvement of the Christian may differ little outwardly from the non-Christian. Rather the difference appears "in the spiritual resources available to him, his motivations to service, his attitudes toward other people, his reasons for the goals to which he commits himself, his understanding of human failure, and his experience of the reality of grace and forgiveness." The Christian can and indeed must cooperate with all men for the achievement of sound public policy.

Finally, the role of the church in the political process is described in terms of intercessory prayer, study and discussion groups, and "constructive suggestions for the shaping of public policy." But the statement also remains open to the possibility of corporate church stands on specific issues and candidates: "Whether specific issues and candidates should be supported or opposed is a matter best left to specific decision in light of immediate political realities and current social situations." The church's role is further described in "the Church's Role in Society," outlined in Chapter V.

Beyond encouraging active citizenship roles for its laymen, the ALC also has affirmed the political responsibilities of its clergy. However, the ALC has been somewhat more cautious in the role which it has defined for its ministers. "Christian Social Action Through Public Witness" recognizes that "[f]rom time to time clergymen are called upon to participate in various social action endeavors as a means of calling issues to public attention, or of promoting remedial action on such issues." The Commission-issued position indicates that pastors can engage in the same forms of social action as any other citizens, but also recognizes that a minister "is responsible to both his congregation and the Church at large, and represents them even if in an

XUM

unofficial way by participating or not participating in social action causes." Pastors are encouraged to understand the social situation fully before taking any specific course of action as well as to consult with the board of the congregation before major involvement in a controversial issue. In 1968 pastors were requested to avoid use of the name of their congregation or religious institution when and if they endorsed political candidates.[1]

Citizenship and political rights also were treated in "Public Authority, Dissent and Civil Disobedience," approved by the Commission on Research and Social Action in the spring of 1969. The position paper describes government as "one of God's means for regulating man's life in community" and "essential to the general welfare and necessary for the maintenance of public order," making possible "the pursuit of justice, peace, freedom, and equality of opportunity." The statement views active citizenship as "an expression of obedience to God and of service to the community." At the same time, however, "the possibility of tension and conflict between one's duty to Caesar and one's duty to God" is recognized. The statement understands law as a method for regulating society, "an instrument for protecting human rights and a means for creating opportunities for self-fulfillment and for the responsible exercise of human freedom." Law is portrayed as a dynamic process as well as a code of regulations. Because of the influence which self-interest and power have upon law, Christians are urged to "be on guard lest law becomes exploitive or oppressive, domineering rather than serving." "The abuse of law clearly distorts God's intention for government, undermines respect for public authority, erodes the concept of the rule of law, and subverts the legal system." The statement suggests that efforts be made "to integrate concern for law and order, on the one hand, with the quest for justice, on the other."

---

[1] "Institutional Identification in Political Endorsements."

"Public Authority, Dissent, and Civil Disobedience" upholds the right of dissent, defined as "public expression of protest, individual or group, without any violation of law," as a fundamental part of the democratic process. It contends that "[t]he survival of our democratic society requires the maintenance of a climate of toleration in which conflicting views can be expressed and support sought for changes in public policy." Accordingly, it condemns efforts to suppress dissent as well as expressions of dissent "which are intended simply to create confusion and turmoil." The church it is suggested, "has a duty to safeguard human freedoms by actively working for a climate of opinion in which responsible and constructive dissent can be given public expression." Toward this end the church may need to make its facilities available to meetings for the purpose of public protest and indeed at times "may be compelled to express its collective dissent with respect to a particular policy or situation." Or "there may even be circumstances when churches and their members may need to initiate lawful marches, picketing, and other legal means for dramatizing injustices and grievous social situations."

The statement adopts a cautious stance with respect to civil disobedience which it defines as "the deliberate, public, and non-violent disobedience of a law or a regulation having the effect of law." It observes that when civil disobedience has been used to test the legality of a particular statute, "it is an accepted feature of our legal process." The ambiguous character of civil disobedience is noted:

> On the one hand it may dramatize injustices, including denials of basic human freedoms, and may issue in positive movement toward corrective action. On the other hand, it may result in diminished respect for public authority, increase divisions within the community, and exaggerate an individualism that breeds contempt for law and due process. Civil disobedience may either contribute to justice or it may lead to greater injustice, even though its intent be to bring about amendment, repeal, or correction of an unjust or oppressive situation or to direct an appeal to a higher authority.

While the position urges caution in any use of civil disobedience, any absolute condemnation or sanction is avoided:

> From its understanding of the whole counsel of God it believes it cannot, without qualification, either sanction or condemn civil disobedience as a tactic for forcing changes in civil law. Rather it believes that any judgment with respect to the use of disavowal of civil disobedience can be made only with reference to a particular situation under the guidance of the ever-active Spirit of God.

It further notes that Christians "have the moral duty to protest against, and to refuse to obey, laws which violate life, human worth and integrity, the basic rights and protections due every person, and which limit the religious freedom of the church."

Criteria to guide the use of civil disobedience also are listed:

> If civil disobedience is used (and we again emphasize our note of caution) we believe that it should be adopted only for directing public attention to a particular law or situation which is manifestly and grossly unjust, only as a final resort when all legal means of redress have been reasonably exhausted or when no legal means are available, only when the methods used are no more excessive than the injustices against which the action is directed, and only when one is prepared and willing to bear the full legal consequences for his action. Participants should seek forms of protest which are appropriate in the context of the grievance. They also need to respect the legitimate rights of others, lest a minority tyrannize the majority.

It is the protestor's willingness to bear the full legal consequences for his action which "makes clear his respect for law, authority, and law enforcement even as he challenges what he believes to be an unjust law or an oppressive situation." The statement concludes by affirming that the church must be open to every person, "no matter how unpopular his views nor how serious his actions."

Finally, in a statement dealing with political rights, "Home Rule for the District of Columbia," approved by the Church Council in 1967, the ALC endorsed limited home rule for residents of the District of Columbia. It affirmed that residents should have power of self-government in local affairs. It recognized that there may be difficult factors in granting such home rule, but repudiated racial considerations as a relevant factor. The statement also called upon the Congress to pay, in lieu of taxes, a fair share of revenue to meet the requirements of self-government.

In its positions in the area of citizenship and political rights the ALC has developed statements which are consistent with its political role, described in Chapter V. Christians are encouraged to participate actively in civic affairs and in the political process. Such activity is stressed as a Christian duty. Pastors, too, are encouraged to participate in public affairs, although with concern for the implications of political activity in the life of the congregation. Government is viewed as an instrument of God for the purposes of order and justice. "Politics" and "compromise" are viewed positively as necessary ingredients of community life. The statements hold open the possibility that even the corporate church may find it necessary to engage in political action, although the positions stress caution in this regard.[1]

Family Life and Health

It is in the area of family life and health that Reuss has given greatest leadership in the development of social policy in the ALC. His drafts are models of balanced positions, combining the insights of Christian faith and competent social analysis. The statements reflect progressive attitudes toward the topics and indicate expert acquaintance with problems of family life. However, this area contains the fewest implications for public policy.

"The Church and Human Sexuality," adopted by the 1966

---

1. The possibility of corporate church action affirmed in these positions should be compared with the ambiguity of the ALC's action. Cf. Chapter 5.

General Convention, considers various dimensions of human sexuality. Only the sections on sex education programs, induced abortion, and pornography relate to public policy. Sex education programs in congregations and in the public schools are encouraged, although the political controversy of such programs is not treated. Induced abortion is approved for "therapeutic reasons." The position calls for studies and discussion to determine what should constitute such reasons. The statement also endorses "responsible efforts" to curb pornography, without, however, defining what is meant by the phrase.

Another major ALC position in this area is "Teachings and Practice on Marriage and Divorce," adopted by the 1964 General Convention. Marriage and divorce are recognized both as legal states and as processes. The process of building a marriage precedes the legal act of marriage in the same way that the process of alienation culminates in divorce. The traditional grounds for divorce in adultery and willful desertion are noted, but the statement observes that other factors may also lead to divorce. The possibility of divorce is considered "sometimes as the lesser of several evils." However, the statement does not suggest any changes in state marriage or divorce laws.

The ALC's most comprehensive statement on birth control is the Commission's statement, "Responsible Reproduction," circulated in the church in 1967 and 1968. The statement views human reproduction as a gift rather than a mandate from God, to be used or not used through responsible choice. It suggests that family income, the health of the mother, and the emotional capacity of parents to rear the child be included in criteria for determining the choice of a child. The right of every child to be "a wanted child" is strongly emphasized. Accordingly, "Responsible Reproduction" endorses birth control:

> Toward this end they normally will practice contraception, using mechanical, chemical, biological, or other means, or they may prefer to practice periodic continence. The means the couple will use is for them to decide together, within their own free consciences, in recognition of their individual circumstances, on the basis of reliable medical advice, and in a sense of accountability to God and neighbor. No one means or method toward this goal has any moral merit over another.

"Responsible Reproduction" proposes far reaching liberalization in existing state abortion laws:

> Laws governing therapeutic abortion need to be amended in a more broadly permissive direction. Laws should permit a therapeutic abortion not only when the mother's life is endangered but also when her health is threatened with severe physical or mental impairment. Laws also could be liberalized to permit a therapeutic abortion in the instance of a child conceived of incest or forcible rape or to a mother barely in her teens. In none of these instances is the child likely to be the product of mutual desire or conscious choice, a wanted child cherished as "a heritage from the Lord," Where there is a substantial risk that the child might be born with grave mental or physical defect the parents might also be given the option of a therapeutic abortion.

However, the statement warns that abortion "must be viewed as an emergency, not a normal, measure for reproduction control." In any case, the statement goes beyond the 1966 General Convention statement, "The Church and Human Sexuality," which called for discussion as to what should constitute "therapeutic reasons," and the 1963 Church Council statement, "Therapeutic Abortion," which limited abortion to situations in which the life of the mother was involved or when her health was threatened "with severe physical or mental impairment." The Church Council position specifically exluded abortion in cases of possible deformity, comparing such an abortion to Hitler's call for euthanasia for deformed people. It also posed the possible conflict of abortion with the Fifth Commandment.

The section on abortion in "Responsible Reproduction" has been further modified in "Abortion and the Law," adopted by the Commission on Research and Social action in 1969 for possible submission to the 1970 General Convention. The position notes that anti-abortion laws are largely unenforceable. "Abortion and the Law" regards the embryo as a potential rather than an actual human being. Emphasizing the need of a child to be "a wanted child," the paper urges that the question of abortion be left as a voluntary choice by the parents after appropriate counselling opportunities at community counselling services. It calls for the abolition of all statutes on abortion, except the requirement that the operation be performed by a duly licensed physician. The Commission urges, as minimum action, major amendment of existing laws:

> Pending such thorough-going reform through repeal, we endorse the major amendment of existing laws. Such amendments, we believe, should define as therapeutic any interruption of a pregnancy in which there is substantial risk that continuance of the pregnancy would gravely impair the physical or mental health of the mother or that the child would be born with grave physical or mental defect. Similarly, we hold that an abortion should be regarded as therapeutic when the

> pregnancy resulted from rape, incest, or other felonious assault, including illicit sexual intercourse with a girl below the age of legal consent. In all such cases the interruption of pregnancy should be a permissive option, not a compulsory requirement.

But the preliminary statement stresses that abortion should not be regarded as a basic measure for population or fertility control. Rather such ends should be obtained by continence or by contraception.

Artificial insemination is viewed favorably in "Responsible Reproduction" when the husband is the donor, but because of "clouded legal, social, biological, and psychological questions" the statement cautions against the use of semen from a third party. The legal questions are not denoted. However, the statement recognizes that

> [t]here may be an occasional rare situation where both husband and wife are usually mature emotionally, where their marriage is solidly grounded and of proven stability, where the process is handled by trustworthy medical practitioners, and where the step is preceded by long and intensive counseling, that artificial insemination from an anonymous donor may seem essential.

The statement also allows for voluntary sterilization in certain instances. For medical and psychological reasons, couples are urged to use medically-recommended contraceptive measures. "Even so, seen in relation to the purposes of marriage, in the maturity of responsible choice, and in the light of competent medical and spiritual counsel, voluntary sterilization may prove for some couples, especially those in their forties and those carrying genetic defects, a responsible denial of further parenthood." In a 1963 statement, "Pastoral Counsel Concerning Voluntary Sterilization," the Commission on

Research and Social Action had taken a similar position. That statement also accepted voluntary sterilization for health and eugenic reasons, but it strongly contended that sterilization "ought never be used as a socially-sanctioned punishment either for personal misdeeds or for behavior contrary to community standards."

"Responsible Reproduction" limits the right of reproduction to married couples. It contends that public policy, "without condoning sexual immorality, realistically must countenance the use of contraception by the unmarried as an evil less grievous than the hurt and tragedy suffered by an ill-begotten and unwanted child." It also warns against possible efforts to control the quality of the population through enforced selective reproduction and genetic manipulation.

Few specific public policy changes are directly proposed in the area of family life and health. In general the ALC statements in this area indicate what the church regards as desirable family life practices without stating the particular political changes necessary to give legal support for the positions. In matters of sex education programs, pornography, marriage and divorce, artificial insemination, and voluntary sterilization social positions are articulated which relate to public policy but no particular policy changes are mentioned. Only in the case of induced abortion has the ALC recommended specific changes in the present laws, changes which allow for a liberalization of current practices.

XUM

Church-State Relations

The ALC has adopted a number of policy statements on church-state relations. The first General Convention statement in this area was approved in 1962 when federal aid to religious and other private institutions was being rapidly increased. "Federal Aid for Church Institutions" is cautiously receptive to such aid. The tension between the church's fear of government restrictions and its desire to use federal aid for community service is recognized. The Convention statement distinguishes between grants and loans to individuals and grants and loans to institutions. It considers the former to be "an investment in people and an exercise of the general welfare power of the Congress." It further expresses the view that church institutions "have every right and freedom to serve, and to receive payment from, persons benefitting from such federal assistance." It warns, however, that such aid should not be accepted to the extent that its curtailment or elimination would jeopardize the existence of the institution or its amount compromise the institution's religious character.

Government loans and grants to church colleges, hospitals, nursing homse, and homes for the aged are seen as posing more serious complications. The statement specifically warns about the possible danger of government controls and of growing dependence upon the government at the expense of the church, although it recognizes that loans pose less danger than grants.

It also points to the danger of continuing obligations which grants may require. Institutions are encouraged to favor non-recurring loans or grants for capital purposes over annually-recurring subsidies to support the operating budget. Approval is given to contracts for specific services, projects, or programs, providing they do not divert the institution from its basic program and objectives.

It is interesting to note that the Board of Social Service a year earlier, suggested that the church should think twice before erecting a facility for which federal funds were not available.[1] The Church Council had requested the board to evaluate a National Lutheran Council statement on the use of Hill-Burton funds. The statement concludes that wherever possible the church should finance its own health and welfare facilities. But it added that if a need existed and federal funds were the only available source, such funds should be used.

The most comprehensive statement of the ALC on church-state issues, "Church-State Relations in the U.S.A.," was commended for study by the 1964 General Convention and adopted two years later. The statement recognizes the American heritage of religious pluralism and points to its constitutional protection:

> The Constitution denies to government the right to interfere with the person's exercise of his religion, provided that he does not offend public decency or tread upon the rights of others. The Constitution prohibits making any religion an established religion. It forbids setting up a religious test as a qualification for public office. The Constitution favors no

---

[1] "Use of Hill-Burton Funds."

> one religion over another.
>
> It follows, therefore, that government must steer a difficult course of benevolent neutrality. It should not, in its policies, discriminate against the institutions of religion, nor should it impose obstacles and burdens which hinder persons in the responsible exercise of their religion. It must protect the freedoms alike of the religious citizens and those who practice no religion. Government has an obligation to foster a climate conducive to the free exercise of religion, to give equal protection to all religious views, and to express its neutrality in terms of actions the probable consequences of which it has carefully weighed.

The position interprets the American heritage as expressing

> a flexible pattern of cooperation between church and state in providing for persons such services as are deemed to be in the public interest and for the good of the community. Neither indifference, nor hostility, nor a wall of separation but a flexible friendly cooperation to achieve what is agreed as being for the common good has marked church-state relationships in America. This has been especially true in the areas of education, welfare services, and ministries to persons in institutions and the armed forces.

However, it warns against too close an identification of each other's programs:

> Governmental grants, loans, and other forms of assistance to religious institutions indeed may enable the churches the more effectively to serve the needs of an expanding society. Such governmental assistance may also, on the other side, compromise the religious character of the institution and jeopardize its essential integrity. What may be good for government may be harmful to the church, or vice versa. One or a few religious groups may be strengthened to the disadvantage of others. Governmental policies may be determined by one or another strong religious group to its own temporal advantage.
>
> The state should not by its actions or inaction show preference for any religious viewpoint. Otherwise, community divisiveness may be intensified, religious animosities may be created, and anti-religious attitudes may be fostered. On the other hand, the state, while not directly supporting or compelling religious teachings or practices, should

> be free to condition the exercise of its coercive powers and be ready to adjust its programs in deference to the religious freedom and the religious expression of the people.

The primary function of the state is "to maintain the kind of civil order that assures peace, justice, and responsible freedom." While the church is to operate under the laws of the state, it "retains the right and the duty to proclaim the prophetic Word of God even in opposition to policies of government which are in conflict with the Word." Christians are counselled to obey the laws of the state "under every circumstance . . . except in the rare event that the demands of men's laws conflict with the Christian's higher loyalty to God."

As a general principle, the Convention statement rejects a blanket judgment on particular forms of cooperation between church and state. Rather it calls on each endeavor to be evaluated on its own merits. The statement also rejects the tendency to establish uniform judicial regulations on all questions of church-state relations: "It should be a matter of central concern that basic constitutional freedoms of race, religion, and conscience are protected, but short of this the solution to the many specific problems involving church-state relations is better left to the states and localities." The latter view, however, ignores the fact that it is just such "specific problems" that interfere with "basic constitutional freedoms of race, religion, and conscience."

Directing its attention to specific issues in church-state relations, the ALC position statement considers the government support of the military and institutional chaplaincy ministry "both a valid exercise of government interest in the whole person and an example of the religious neutrality of the state. Because the government "has removed these persons from the normal freedoms of community life and from the normal congregational ministry of the church," the support of chaplaincy services "witnesses to its concern for religious liberty and the free exercise of religion." In line with this position the Joint Council in the summer of 1968 ruled that one of its clergyman could contract with the state for chaplaincy services.

"Church-State Relations in the U.S.A." also supports the right of citizens to use government benefits such as old age assistant grants, medical payments, hot lunches, grants for dependent children, higher educational benefits, and health and safety education, to obtain the services of church agencies and institutions as well as those of the government. However, direct public support for religious educational institutions was opposed. Indicating disapproval of both Evenson v. Board of Education (1947) and Cochrane v. Louisiana State Board of Education (1930), the statement argues that "to provide bus transportation or school textbooks at public expense for children enrolled in parochial schools is fraught with such divisive consequences that it is contrary to good public policy." The "divisive consequences" are not specified. One is tempted to suggest that the ALC's receptivity to government grants or loans for church colleges but not for parochial schools is partially conditioned by the fact that the ALC operates numerous colleges but very few secondary educational facilities.

The church-state position also discusses tax policies affecting the church. It justifies tax deductions for personal contributions to non-profit institutions, including religious institutions, as necessary "to avoid total reliance upon governmental agencies, and for the mutually healthy and corrective influence between governmental and voluntary agencies." In a position in advance of American public policy, the statement allows for taxation of parsonages, unrelated business activities of the churches, and for municipal service fees to the church. It calls for continued tax exemption for church buildings used specifically for religious purposes:

> Tax exemption of church buildings owned and used directly and solely for worship, educational, and eleemosynary purposes is a sound exercise of public policy. It recognizes the contributions the church and its institutions make to community life. To levy upon churches non-discriminatory charges for municipal services such as water, sewage, police, and fire protection we believe is an action consistent with sound public policy. We believe that the churches should be willing to accept equitable taxation of parsonages and other dwellings owned by churches, associations of churches, or religious orders in which their staff members reside.
>
> Churches owning properties and conducting business not exclusively and solely essential to their religious, charitable, or educational ministry ought to be subject to tax laws and policies equally applicable to those governing profit-seeking individuals, partnerships, and corporations.

The same stance has been incorporated into "Tax Reform: A Cause for Christian Action."

Prior to the above ALC position, the Church Council had adopted a resolution on "Income Tax Deductibility for Church Contributions." Objecting to a proposed change in the

XUM

federal tax laws which would have allowed deductibility only on those contributions in excess of 5% of adjusted gross income, the resolution argues that there are "social and spiritual benefits for the entire nation which result when individuals willingly accept the responsibility of providing certain services, which values are diminished or lost when the same or similar services are provided through tax sources." The statement does not indicate which values are supposedly lost or provide any evidence to support the implied contention that religious contributions would decrease without tax deductibility of such contributions.

"Church-State Relations in the U.S.A." supports the rulings of the Supreme Court in Engel v. Vitale (1962) and Abington School District v. Schempp and Murray v. Curlett (1963):

> Reading of Scripture and addressing deity in prayer are forms of religious expression which devout persons cherish. To compel these religious exercises as essential parts of the public school program, however, is to infringe on the distinctive beliefs of religious persons as well as on the rights of the irreligious. We believe that freedom of religion is best preserved when Scripture reading and prayer are centered in home and church, their effects in the changed lives of devout persons radiating into the schools and into every area of community life.

But the statement urges that schools not ignore the influence of religion upon culture and persons. Claiming that a rounded education should include knowledge of major religious groups and the influence of religion in life, the ALC position suggests that "[t]he objective for the public schools in this direction is understanding rather than commitment, a teaching about rather than a teaching of religion." The statement proposes that questions relating to the observance of religious holidays and the use of public property for religious use should be left to the decision of local communities. Finally, the statement urges that greater consideration be given to programs of released time, dismissed time, and shared time in order to encourage a "genuinely benevolent neutrality on the part of government and a fresh approach to the free exercise of religion in education not otherwise attainable." The statement also warns that "[i]t is as wrong for the public schools to become agents for atheism, godless secularism, scoffing irreligion, or a vague 'religion in general' as it is for them to make religious rites and ceremonies an integral part of their programs."[1]

The 1964 General Convention adopted two other statements on church-state issues. One of them, "Prayer in the Public Schools," flatly opposed the proposals then pending before the Congress to give constitutional sanction to various religious practices in public institutions and in public life. Accepting the reasoning of the Supreme Court, the General Convention recognized

> that such practices are essentially ritualistic in character, that any form of religious practice opens the way for sectarian intrusion into the public school program, that such practices offend minority groups, and that in the end religion suffers and religious liberty in its fullness is threatened when

---

[1] This was the portion of the statement added by the Joint Council which so provoked the Commission on Research and Social Action, leading to a revision of the rules by which the Church and Joint Council amend Commission statements. Cf. Chapter 8, p. 273.

> government uses the power of its laws and the public school program to prescribe an official faith. Devotional exercises for the cultivation and nurture of religious faith belong in the home and the church.

The statement notes that the Supreme Court's decisions did not outlaw prayer and the study of the Bible in the public schools, but only prohibited officially prescribed religious exercises calling for corporate participation.

In "Sunday Closing Laws," the 1964 General Convention supported the Supreme Court in the 1961 Sunday Closing Cases. Quoting from McGowan v. Maryland, the Convention argued for "a community day of rest," even though religious purposes were served simultaneously. It recognizes that "[c]hurches do not need Sunday closing laws in order to protect themselves." Rather it observes that economic interests generally were behind the debate on Sunday closing laws. Idealistically, the statement urges "that the issue be settled not primarily by law and the force of government but rather by voluntary agreement worked out in each community on the basis of its own needs and experiences." The previous year, however, the Church Council had opposed a proposal to hold national elections on Saturday and Sunday, specifically for religious reasons.[1]

The ALC also has taken positions on a number of other church-state issues. In 1961 the Church Council authorized the Division of World Missions to utilize the services of Peace Corps volunteers, even though the latter had been selected and assigned to projects by the government, on the ground that the Peace Corps undertook no religious program.[1] In 1963 it requested the Congress to enact legislation providing for a religious census in 1966.[2]

---

[1] "Change of National Election Days." Interview with Herbert Nottbohm, assistant to the president, August 4, 1969.

The 1966 General Convention refused to adopt a proposal which would have petitioned the Congress to make mandatory the inclusion of ministers in the Social Security system on a self-employed basis.[3] The Board of Pensions had originally urged that the participation be mandatory with the right of a minister to elect out for reasons of conscience, the position which the Congress subsequently adopted. The General Convention instead endorsed the continued voluntary participation of ministers in Social Security on a self-employed basis.

In 1968 the Church Council adopted "Exemption from Military Service for Divinity Students." The position notes that there is no basis in Scripture or in the church's confessions to separate clergy or ministerial students from other Christians in citizenship responsibilities with respect to service in the armed forces. It also observes that such exemptions may isolate pastors from experience which will be useful in their ministry. But, it holds,

> the decision to exempt divinity students from such service is one made by the government and not by the churches. This law of the land is prompted by a

---

[1] "Peace Corps I."

[2] "Religious Census"

[3] "Social Security Coverage for Ministers."

> strong tradition in our democracy that the welfare of our people and society, in war as in peace, depends in great measure on the spiritual ministry which the Church alone provides, and that, if congregations should suffer a serious shortage of pastors, the very fabric of our national life would be in jeopardy.

In a line of reasoning which the church would most certainly not use in other problems of church-state relations, it contends that "it would be unwise for The American Lutheran Church to take action to deny its members the right to accept the judgment of the government and to prevent from enrolling in its seminaries young men who may otherwise be eligible for military service." The Church Council was not about to suggest a change in national policy which was beneficial to the church. It even deleted a portion of the original proposal which said: "We are, however, sensitive to inequities in the present law and join with other churches in encouraging work toward a more suitable program."

The ALC in another action requested that midshipmen and cadets at the military academies be granted freedom to attend worship service of their own choice in lieu of compulsory attendance at a general chapel service.[1] The General Convention commended the concern of the government for providing worship services, but requested that the servicemen be allowed to attend services of their own choice. The General Convention dropped a clause in the resolution which held that "[t]he integrity of religion is vitiated by any external compulsion. . . ."

---

[1] "Compulsory Attendance at Worship Services at Military Academies."

Finally, the ALC has adopted two statements relating to religious faith and public office. In 1961 it approved "Religious Faith as a Factor in American Elections," which affirms that "[t]he religious affiliation of a candidate for political office is a valid concern of the voter, but in a democratic order a candidate ought not to be supported or opposed merely on the grounds of his religious affiliation without regard to his record or to his other qualifications." The position recognizes that religious faith has an effect on conduct in public office, but insists that "[t]he fitness of a candidate for public office depends upon many qualifications." It mentions personal qualities, a candidate's past record, the record of his party and the policies of his supporters as other valid considerations. Thus, the statement adopts a stance in which religious affiliation as one factor "has to be balanced against all the qualifications of this candidate and other candidates, and should not be taken out of the context of the total political situation in which the voter has to make his decision." In 1962 the Commission on Research and Social Action, responding to a request that it oppose the Supreme Court's decision in Torcaso v. Watkins (1961), stated that it did "not see how the Supreme Court could have ruled otherwise."[1]

In these positions on church-state relations, the ALC seeks to support a middle way between a strict "wall of separation" between church and state on the one hand, and too close a relationship between them on the other hand. It believes that the nation's religious heritage should be recognized and that creative relationships are possible between the church and state without jeopardizing the integrity of the other. The ALC thus supports the principle of institutional separation and functional interaction mentioned in Chapter IV.

---

[1] "Religious Test for Public Office."

On specific issues the ALC seems to be in general accord with the evolving patterns in church-state relations in this country. For example, it supports the Supreme Court's prayer and Bible reading decisions, and its rulings on Sunday closing laws and religious oaths for public office. However, it disagrees with the earlier rulings on bus transportation and textbooks for parochial schools. It assumes a conservative stance in urging that many patterns be left up to the discretion of local communities.

The ALC recognizes the tension between assistance from the government encourages farmers to make greater use of such measures. The statement does not explicitly call for the inclusion of farmers under the protection of farmers under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, however.

Another agricultural problem which has come before the Commission is the grape strike in California. "The Grape Controversy" recognizes that the central issue is the organization of farm workers. It interprets the current boycott as an effort by the workers to gain collective bargaining rights. The statement calls for legal recognition of the worker's right to organize and bargain collectively, for increased education and retraining opportunities, and for assistance to the workers in order that they can utilize the social and legal services available to them in their communities. The position also encourages the small grower to expand cooperative efforts and urges government to make tax reforms and grant legal recognition for growers to establish fair and equitable prices.

Another issue currently being discussed in the ALC is capital punishment. Approved by the Commission on Research and Social Action in 1969, "The Death Penalty" notes that Christians have appealed to Scripture both in defense of and in opposition to capital punishment. The statement seeks to avoid this impass by arguing that the state, whose God-given function is to pursue order and insure justice, "can utilize those means it deems necessary and appropriate to fulfill its basic functions." The position recognizes that government traditionally has viewed capital punishment as such a necessary means, but contends that today a growing body of public opinion "holds that the exercise of capital punishment actually hinders the state from performing its total God-given role with justice and equity." As support for this view, the statement mentions the impossibility of correcting any miscarriage of justice; the double standard against the non-white, poor and uneducated in the application of capital punishment; the fact that "the interest of society requires not punitive vengeance but protection of the innocent and correction and rehabilitation of the offender;" the questionable deterrent value of the death penalty; and the claim that it is an inhumane and sadistic form of punishment.

For these reasons, the statement suggests that the death penalty is a form of "practical injustice." Accordingly, it holds, as a minimum, that the use of capital punishment be made "permissive" or discretionary rather than obligatory and that increased attention be given to the improvement of the nation's system of criminal justice. "The Death Penalty" also proposes a ten-year moratorium on the use of capital punishment, during which time public opinion can determine whether it is still required for public order.

The Commission on Research and Social Action also approved"Tax Reform: A Cause for Christian Action" in 1969. The statement says that tax policies need both to maintain a strong and viable private sector of the economy at the same time that adequate tax revenues for public purposes are provided. Evaluating the various types of taxes, the preliminary statement states:

> A tax on gross income, progressive in a ratio to a reasonable maximum but with provision for reduction because of unusual or disadvantaging circumstances, appear to be the necessary core of any modern tax system. General sales taxes, unless exemptions are built into the tax provisions, weigh unduly heavily upon the poor, since virtually all of their income is spent in consumer channels. Excise taxes can be levied selectively, and thus can be either proportional to the use of the taxed item or reflective of presumed ability to pay. The general property tax on real estate is inflexible and overworked, and on personal property or intangibles is difficult to enforce. Nevertheless, some sort of equitable balance among these major forms of taxation is desirable. Similarly necessary is a reconsideration of the relative taxing powers and forms of taxation best suited to each of the levels of government in the American federal system.

Tax loopholes, defined as "unintended openings for tax avoidance,

XUM

as distinguished from intended favored treatment in order to encourage activities defined as being in the public interest," were criticized. However, the statement fails to consider that an "unintended opening for tax avoidance" to one person may be "intended favored treatment . . . in the public interest" to another. Possible tax loopholes are seen in the areas of capital gains, tax-free investment in state and local bonds, unlimited charitable deductions, housing allowances for clergy, depletion and depreciation allowances, the structure and operations of foundations, and non-related business activities on non-profit organizations. As noted earlier, the statement endorsed taxation of unrelated business activities of churches, parsonages, and the payment of equitable municipal service charges on churches.

As an indication of the church's increasing concern about violence in American life, the Commission on Research and Social Action in cooperation with the Commission on Public Communication issued "Violence in Television Programming" in the fall of 1969. The position was approved by the Executive Committee of the Church Council. The statement proposes the creation of a national organization, such as a Citizen's Commission on Television or a National Council on Broadcasting Excellence, to help clarify the goals and objectives, define the standards, and watch the performance of television. Network officials are commended for the self-policing measures they have taken, but the position notes that additional research on the effects of television violence is needed.

XUM

In other matters, brief statements on traffic safety and the Peace Corps were adopted. The 1968 General Convention statement, "Traffic Safety," endorses federal and state efforts to promote safety, especially to control driving by persons under the influence of alcohol or drugs. It also urges that commercial interests give increased attention to traffic safety. On the Peace Corps, the 1968 Convention commended Christian participation in the national service organization.[1] The 1962 General Convention had previously endorsed the objectives of the Peace Corps, commended the President and the Congress for the inauguration of the program, and encouraged qualified Lutherans to participate in the program.[2]

Reviewing its expressions since 1961, it is surprising that the ALC has considered so few problems relating to social and economic life. Except for problems relating to race relations, most American domestic issues belong in this subject category. Yet until 1968 social and economic problems were virtually ignored by the Commission on Research and Social Action. Recently the Commission has treated a number of problems, most notably agricultural life, capital punishment, and tax reform. Most of the statements refer to proposed changes in public policy, although the changes are stated in general terms. The federal government is encouraged to take a number of steps to assist American agriculture, including increased

---

1. "Peace Corps III."

2. "Peace Corps II."

XUM

support for collective bargaining rights. Eventual abolition of the death penalty is advocated. The call for tax reform includes the closing of several loopholes and reduced dependence on property taxes.

Race Relations

The ALC has adopted a number of position statements in the area of race relations. While many of these statements establish policy to guide the church, the major concern in this section will be with those statements which relate to public policy.

Soon after the merger in 1961 the Church Council adopted a National Lutheran Council statement which had earlier been adopted by the bodies amalgamating into the ALC. "A Christian Affirmation on Human Relations" calls for inclusive membership in congregations and encourages members "to exercise their social responsibility by acting in their own communities to remove whatever injustices exist and to insure for all persons, without discrimination, just and equal opportunities, especially in housing, employment, education, and access to social welfare services." The position was incorporated into the 1964 General Convention statement, "Effective Ministry in Intercultural Communities":

> Nevertheless, churches, their members, and their leaders need also to exercise Christian social responsibility. They have the duty to protest against and to act responsibly, beginning in their own communities, to correct those cruelties and injustices which deny

> basic human freedoms. Christians, both personally and corporately, have the duty to press for and to support measures which insure that all persons, regardless of color, economic position, national origin, or ethnic grouping have fair and equal access, for example, to education, housing, employment, voting, and public accommodations.

This same support for racial equality is shown in the statements, "Equality of Opportunity--A Civil Right" and "Open Housing," adopted by the 1966 General Convention. The first statement affirms equality of opportunity as "a basic civil right which any government must safeguard." It calls upon Americans to make the civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution "a living reality experienced equally by each person within the jurisdiction of the United States." The General Convention, resentful of the appearance of the Black Power movement, still envisioned a fully integrated society:

> As a church concerned for the total well-being of every person, we deplore and condemn the racial hostility and antagonism symbolized in the terms "black power" and "white backlash." Separation, alienation, and rejection along racial lines can become the means by which demonic and alien forces may destroy our nation. We desire a land in which Negro and white, Indian and Oriental, Puerto Rican, Latin American, or person of any other ancestry, may cultivate his abilities, develop his strengths, display his creativity, take pride in his heritage, and win appreciation for his contributions to the common good.

Pastors and members of the ALC are asked to examine their complicity in racial injustice and "to take vigorous, skillful, and patient measures to build bridges of communication and understanding between alienated segments of our society." Rather than condemning social protests, members are urged to participate actively in efforts to further equality of opportunity.

The statement, "Open Housing," endorses "the right of each individual to live where his economic means make it possible for him to live, without any restriction as to race, creed, color, or national origin." While the resolution favors voluntary compliance, it supports the adoption of open housing legislation by any level of government where such legislation is deemed necessary. It makes no mention, however, of zoning regulations which effectively serve to perpetuate economic stratification.

In these statements the ALC affirms the values of justice and equality for all races. Noticeably absent, however, are endorsements of particular goals, the "middle axioms," which would give content and meaning to the broad moral affirmations. Policy goals with respect to housing, employment, education, etc., are overlooked. The resolution on "Open Housing" moves in this direction, but even in that instance, legal provision for social justice is considered less satisfactory than voluntary compliance. The problem, of course, is that everyone is for "equality of opportunity" until the specific steps to express it are proposed. One might have expected that the ALC could do more than recite slogans.

"Endorsement of the Kerner Commission Recommendations," adopted by the Commission on Research and Social Action in 1968, moves closer to specific goals. Citing the words of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, the statement calls upon the members of the church "'to turn with all the purpose at our command to the major unfinished business of this nation. It is time to adopt strategies for action that will produce quick and visible progress. It is time to make good the promise of American democracy to all citizens . . . .'" The recommendations of the Kerner Commission with respect to community responses, police and community relations, control of disorders, the administration of justice under emergency conditions, damages, and national action in the areas of employment, education, welfare, and housing are endorsed.

In a brief resolution, the 1968 General Convention also recommended to ALC members that they withhold support from political candidates who appeal to racism.[1] The resolution was most pointedly aimed at the candidacy of George Wallace.

The 1968 General Convention adopted two statements which direct ALC action in race relations, "Decision in a Time of National Crisis" and "Project Equality." The former position interprets the national crisis as

> a ringing demand for justice and equity in all human relationships. Minorities demand for each person the respect, recognition, freedom, equality, opportunity, and protection due every human being, regardless of his race, religion, national origin, wealth, or any other condition of life. They demand equal justice under law, impartial enforcement of all laws, equality of opportunity, honesty in business dealings, fair prices, just wages, dependable goods and services, and the right to take part in making the decisions that affect them. Lonely voices demand an end to the exploitation, oppression, denial of opportunity, indifference, insensitivity, and the other forms of inhumanity which they see inflicted too often by the strong on the weak. They demand that power be used to effect mercy, equity and opportunity, peace and freedom, righteousness and honor.

---

[1] "Racism and Political Candidates."

XUM

The main portion of the statement includes programmatic objectives which are to guide the ALC response to the crisis. One of the objectives directs the ALC to "[h]elp formulate and support sound goals of public policy relating to justice and a responsive society, especially focusing critical attention upon legislative, executive, and judicial efforts in the areas of housing, employment, education, welfare, health, and police and law enforcement practices." "Project Equality" directs the church to implement present public law by using the purchasing power of the church to promote equal employment opportunities. The Church Council reaffirmed its concern for racial justice again in the summer of 1969.[1] In addition to these statements the ALC also has adopted a number of other policy guidelines for the church.[2] These, however, have no particular bearing on public policy.

The ALC has consistently supported racial equality in its statements. The church's positions call upon the members to work actively for racial justice, including legislative activity. The church has found it difficult, however, to translate these broad goals into specific goals which can guide political action. Not the least of the reasons for this has

---

[1] "The Black Manifesto" and "Minority Issues"

[2] "Enforcement of Non-Discrimination in ALC Congregations" (1963), "Endorsement of Lutheran Human Relations Association of America" (1964), "Interracial Contacts" (1964), "Open Membership Clause in Model Constitution" (1964), "Effective Ministry in Intercultural Communities" (1964), and "The National Crisis and the ALC" (1968).

XUM

been its failure to include minority group persons in the preparation of its policy positions. On the other hand, the ALC has adopted specific programmatic guidelines to direct the ALC's response to the crisis in race. However, as was indicated in Chapter VII, the church has yet to indicate its willingness to act on these more recent measures which it has adopted.

International Affairs

The major ALC social policy statements in the area of international affairs relate to the concerns of Communism, war and peace, Vietnam, world hunger and economic development, and United States ratification of the human rights covenants. The church has adopted ten statements in this area.

The subject of Communism was the first area of concentration by the Commission on Research and Social Action. Upon its recommendation, the Church Council adopted "The Church's Role in Combatting Communism" in 1961. It is clear from the context of the statement that its primary concern is to warn church members about the tactics used by some of the more militant anti-Communist organizations in this country. It cautions against the use of smears, character assassination, and other irresponsible charges. It encourages members to study Communist ideology and methods, emphasizing positive goals to which people can give their energies and devotion and engage in responsible action.

In the Cold War language of the 50's, the statement warns about "the steadily growing menace of international Communism." It condemns Communism because

> [i]t denies the Triune God, and divorces man from divinely intended fellowship with his Creator. It breeds not love but hate. It sees man not as a person but a thing, expecting him to serve the state rather than the state to serve him. Truth is a concept it neither knows nor practices. It employs any means, however ruthless, cynical, or deceitful, to gain its ends. Its end is the total allegiance--heart, mind, soul, and body--of all who come under its power.

The statement ignores the existence of divergent blocs within the Communist world as well as the efforts of Communist governments to meet the contemporary needs of their people. While the statement indeed portrays one face of communism, such a harsh one-sided presentation does not reflect well on a Commission that prides itself in balanced analysis. The description of Communism in the Church Council's statement is an ideological expression of the Cold War. The statement contends that "whatever noble goals or attractive social ideals Communism may profess actually are already inherent in the underlying principles of democracy and have their roots in Christianity."

"War, Peace and Freedom," adopted at the 1966 General Convention, sets forth an understanding of war and peace today. The statement observes that man now seems to have within his power the ability to destroy the world. It views war as "a consequence of a world estranged from God, a fruit of sinful man's passions." The cause of war is attributed to sin, reflected "in such traits as pride, arrogance, greed, lust for power, divisiveness, hate, bigotry, self-righteousness, and idolatry, including an unquestioning devotion to the goals and the supremacy of his own nation." The statement recognizes the role of balance of power, noting that "war is least likely to erupt when the probable contestants are equally weak and equally incapable of waging war, equally strong and balanced and thus equally sure that they could not win the contest, or equally sure that the opponent possesses not only military power but also the will to use it."

"War, Peace, and Freedom" acknowledges that government has the authority and the responsibility to use force "to promote, foster, and protect justice, morality, equality, peace, order, and respect for inalienable human rights." It notes that "[t]he very readiness to risk war and the very willingness to engage in war may be the only means the nation and its people have for assuring their independence and the preservation of their God-given opportunities and responsibilities."

The statement notes that Article XVI of the Augsburg Confession supports participation in a "just war," but argues that "[t]he conditions and assumptions which underlay Augsburg's guidance for Christian to 'engage in just wars' rarely prevail today."

The church's task, according to the position, is

> to cut through the barrage of propaganda, smokescreens, and verbiage to discover as best as fallible men can discover where truth, righteousness, justice, and mercy reside. It ought to express its collective prophetic judgment on the morality of the issues of national self-interest at stake, the validity of the objectives the opponents claim, the wisdom of the policies pursued, the possible points on which the conflicting interests honorably can be reconciled, and the probable consequences of the struggle upon such values as justice, freedom, long-range peace, and respect for persons.

XUM

It warns that because warring nations tend to justify their stands by an appeal to high moral and ethical principles, church leaders "need to beware lest they be used to give religious sanction or theological justification to a war which is no more than a naked power struggle for material advantage." Significantly it affirms that while Christians will "normally" remain loyal to their nation, they have a higher loyalty to the Lord of the nation. Christians should realize that national conflict will probably always exist, but also should reject the inevitability of a given war. "Rather, they should lend their influence and efforts to work for preventing those struggles and contests in which men and nations exert military power, violence, and force against one another. They should work for justice, harmony, mutual respect and good will, and freedom from violence and civil disturbance which men call peace. . . ." The statement emphasizes a persuasive rather than a coercive role for the church.[1]

Consistent with the earlier attribution of the cause of war to sin, defined as a failure of personal moral virtue, Christians are urged to support programs that promote person-to-person understanding, strengthen their own personal moral qualities, pray, support the church's missionary program and Lutheran World Relief. "Basic to any realistic hope for bringing war under control is a change in men's minds and hearts."

---

[1] The statement interprets the "two kingdoms" sociologically rather than eschatologically. Cf. Chapter 5, p. 164.

A subsequent section supports efforts to "alleviate material and psychological deprivations," multilaterally reduce armaments "to the types and levels necessary to maintain domestic tranquility and peace, insure the peaceful use of outer space, promote technical assistance to developing nations, develop regional associations of nations, strengthen international legal institutions, and increase cultural, economic, educational, and social cooperation between nations. The statement also calls for a limitation of the autonomy of nations, in accord with common world needs.

Finally "War, Peace, and Freedom" recognizes conscientious objection as a defensible Christian stance with respect to participation in war. It requests that the provisions of the Selective Service Act which pertain to alternate service for conscientious objectors be applied to Lutherans. It also reminds pastors of their duty to minister to the conscientious objector. The same position with respect to conscientious objection had been adopted by the Church Council in 1963.[1]

With respect to integration of social analysis and Christian thought, "War, Peace, and Freedom" is one of the least adequate statements adopted by the ALC. In attributing the cause of war to sin, the statement does not seem to recognize that war also may result from the conflict of legitimate and desirable goals, from misunderstanding, or from dissatisfaction with institutional arrangements such as world trade patterns. If war is to be traced to "sin," the latter term must be defined more broadly than a simplistic reference to a shortage of personal moral virtue. Also the statement does not define the "God-given opportunities and responsibilities" for which war may be risked or explain its claim that "[w]ar may become a means to defend moral and spiritual values cherished more highly than goods or life." One is left with no indication as to what conditions justify such a war.

---

[1] "Conscientious Objectors."

Regarding the "just war" concept, it is debatable whether propaganda, total war, and massive mobilization make the concept irrelevant, as the statement suggests, or whether the conditions and circumstances in which the concept must be applied have changed markedly. The statement dismisses the concept but then strongly insists that Christians must make the same kind of discriminating judgments for which the "just war" concept was designed to provide guidance. Thus the statement rejects the concept by name, but calls for its continued application in practice. Church members are left only with an exhortation to use their "conscience" and to "weigh the claims of every governing authority for support of the honor, justice, integrity, and rightness of its cause in light of their own understanding of the divine imperative." It is unclear how these undeveloped references provide greater clarity than the "just war" criteria.

Efforts at both the 1966 and 1968 General Conventions, calling upon the Congress to amend the Selective Service Act by making the alternate service provisions also available to

XUM

selective conscientious objectors, failed. At the present time the ALC recognizes the principle of selective conscientious objection," but insists that selective objectors accept the legal consequences of their refusal to serve in the armed forces.[1] The only portion of the statement on selective conscientious objection which the General Convention adopted urges members and pastors "to counsel with and stand by those who conscientiously object to military service as consistently as they counsel with and stand by those who for equal reasons of conscience serve in the armed forces."[2] It also warns "against attempts to judge a person's patriotism or his Christian faith by his willingness or unwillingness to render military service." The issue of selective conscientious objection will again be presented at the 1970 General Convention.[3]

The war in Vietnam received attention in both the 1966 and 1968 General Conventions. The 1966 statement, "Vietnam Involvement," confesses the church's "uneasy and troubled" mind over the war and calls for increasing emphasis on social, economic, and political measures in the war. It acknowledges confidence in the stated aims of American involvement in the war, but without specifying those aims, and observes that "[m]any of us have an uneasy feeling that our nation's actions may at times belie our stated aims. We do not want our nation to adopt the tactics of deceit, denial of the truth, trickery, and subversion we find so detestable in some other nations." The statement judges that "the communistic governments of Russia and China prefer captive or satellite nations dependent on them rather than genuinely independent nations free to choose courses responsive to their own people." However, it does not indicate which countries are satellites of the People's Republic of China or distinguish between satellites and spheres of influence. The statement strongly upholds the right to dissent on the war policy. As for specific action, it asks the members "to study the issues and express themselves to their leaders in government" and to engage "in fervent intercessory prayer and genuine repentance."

---

[1] "War, Peace, and Freedom" (1966), para. 14.

[2] "Pastoral Counsel for Selective Conscientious Objectors."

[3] "National Service and Selective Service Reform" will be considered by the Commission on Research and Social Action in April, 1970.

The 1968 statement, "Vietnam 1968," is almost as mildly worded as its earlier counterpart. It recognizes the long struggle of the Vietnamese for independence from outside rule, and blames the United States, along with the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Unions, and both Vietnamese governments, for the present difficulty. In very tempered language it criticizes the direction of American involvement in the war:

> An increasing number of America are becoming critical of what they regard as a continuing Americanization of the war and its escalation, the high rate of civilian casualties, the limited support given to the Saigon Government by the South Vietnamese people, and widespread corruption among South Vietnamese military and public officials. There is growing anxiety over our country's loss of prestige and moral leadership due to the war. There also are continuing questions of our nation's obligations to treaty provisions which appear to conflict

> with one another. While many persons support the efforts of the American Government to secure a non-communist South as essential to United States' national interest, others question whether our national interest requires such extensive involvement in the area. Numerous voices are raising serious questions relating to the morality and justice of the conflict.

It reaffirms that

> the use of military power must be guided by an emphasis on human rights and values, by a desire to provide the stability through which justice and human community can be pursued. The tragic ambiguity of any military action is that it tends to ruin the created order, to subordinate other values to military necessity, and to destroy a nation's population and social order.

"Vietnam 1968" commends the administration for its "unilateral deescalation of the war," referring to the bombing halt in the North, and calls for a cease fire. It warns the members of the ALC "against undue impatience with the pace of the Paris talks and subsequent peace negotiations." Finally it urges continued reexamination of United States foreign policy.

The General Convention found it difficult to debate the issue of the war in Vietnam. The mild language of the statements reflects the divided mind of the delegates. The 1968 statement is somewhat more "dovish" than the 1966 position, reflecting the fact that the mood of the country had shifted considerably in the intervening two years.

In brief resolutions, the 1962 General Convention supported President Kennedy at the time of the second Cuban crisis and sharply criticized and disassociated itself from the statement of the World Council of Churches which condemned the

American naval quarantine.[1] Considering that the crisis occurred while the General Convention was in session, these statements of support reflect the immediate impulse of citizens to come to the defense of the President in times of national emergency. In 1968 the General Convention condemned the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.[2]

Another problem on which the ALC has expressed itself is hunger and international development. "Hunger in the World" supports a number of actions to alleviate world hunger:

> We should turn our enormous agricultural productivity in larger measure to supply emergency food aid. We should release more of our scientists and technologists to work with those of the younger nations in the slow task of adapting and developing food production, processing, and distribution techniques suitable to specific climates and cultures. We should provide more funds in loans or in grants for development of basic public services and facilities. We should encourage governments to foster policies in which private skills and investment enterprises can play their wholesome role in the economic development of the country. We should assist in the orderly redevelopment of the complex system of interrelated social institutions and social structures needed to achieve the goals and foster the values each country seeks for itself. We should assist not only with health and nutrition measures but also with disseminating information for effective, but voluntary, reproduction controls. We should enlarge our support of and participation in the various international agencies which approach their tasks on a multi-lateral rather than a bi-lateral basis.

The statement also commends government officials and voluntary agencies for their efforts in this direction. In a resolution,

---

[1] "Support for President Kennedy in Cuban Crisis" and "Opposition to W.C.C. Statement on Cuban Crisis."

[2] "Czechoslovakia."

XUM

"International Aid and Development," introduced at the 1968 General Convention, the delegates urged an increase in American aid to developing nations, especially through multilateral approaches; encouraged the president, in cooperation with the Soviet Union, to convert some of the cost of armaments to social reconstruction; and directed attention to the call of the World Council of Churches to devote one percent of the Gross National Product for development aid to new countries.

Finally, in 1967 the Church Council adopted a statement on "U.S. Ratification of Human Rights Covenants." The proposed statement, drafted by the National Lutheran Council, urges Senate ratification of the conventions on genocide, political rights of women, abolition of forced labor, and a supplemental convention on slavery. Due to strong urging from Reuss and the Commission on Research and Social Action, however, the Church Council deleted the call for Senate approval of the conventions. The statement describes the four covenants, notes the influential role of the American government in drafting them, and indicates its "full agreement with the intent and objectives these Conventions seek to realize." Yet the Commission was reluctant to endorse the covenants, claiming that

> the language in its very brevity may become inaccurate, vague, or fuzzy. Each lends itself to the possibility of strained interpretations or hypocritical invoking of the sanctions behind the Conventions.
>
> Will the Iron Curtain countries accuse the U.S. of genocide because it is 'causing serious bodily or mental harm' to Negroes, or the Viet Cong? Who will intervene to insure that Iron Curtain countries give full religious freedom to Jews, Moslems,

> and Christians? Must women be accorded the right to serve on a police force or in the military? Is prison labor forbidden? What country cannot find a person it considers notorious on other counts to have been guilty of breaking some civil law, whether income tax evasion or currency manipulation? Who will judge and enforce the competing claims and counter-claims, and by what standards?

As a result of the reservations, the statement only calls upon the members of the ALC to study the conventions and to convey the results of their study to their Senators.

In general, ALC social policy statements in the area of international affairs press for few changes in public policy. Positions on Communism and war and peace provide an understanding of the subjects for church members. The church was challenged to petition the Congress for a change in the Selective Service Act on behalf of selective conscientious objectors, but refused to do so. The 1966 and 1968 statements on Vietnam evidence anguish over the war, although the latter statement is mildly critical of United States involvement. The stands on world hunger and international development endorse American action and encourage additional efforts in those directions. The stand on the United Nations human rights covenants is critical of the international agreements.

Most international affairs statements reflect the absence of knowledgeable persons in the drafting process. In comparison with the other categories of statements, the ALC's positions in this area stand in greatest need of involvement of such persons. While many of the positions support a number of positive and useful policy goals, serious weaknesses are evident in the church's understanding of international politics.

The attribution of war to sin without further explanation, the claim that individual conversion is central to world peace, rejection of the "just war" concept, an interpretation of Communism solely as a demonic conspiracy, and the kind of objections raised concerning the United Nations covenants are inadequate today.

Political Thought in the ALC

The ALC has adopted social policy statements on a wide range of topics. In general, the positions are consistent with the political role which the church has defined for itself, described in Chapter V. Most positions seek to acquaint ALC members with social problems, leaving political action as such up to the initiative of the individual members.

The statements tend to reflect moderately progressive social thinking. At least they espouse the types of stands usually advanced by political and social leaders in American life whose positions are popularly regarded as moderately progressive. But the political realism of the positions suffers at the expense of social idealism. The basic focus of the statements continues to be upon education as the means to action. The church seems to operate from the premises that a change in attitude will motivate the individual to action and that such action is the only worthwhile action. Thus the statements attempt to define the courses and general direction of needed change, leaving it up to each individual to determine his own response. As a result little specific attention is given in the statements to political action or to proximate political goals.

This means that the ALC essentially is committed to personal and individual action rather than to social and corporate action. The focus of concern is attitudes rather than structural changes. The reality of power is virtually ignored in ALC policy statements. Yet it is precisely social and political power that influences public policy. By ignoring the role of social structures and political and social power, the statements effectively deny the very means which are necessary to accomplish the broad policy goals reflected in the statements.

As noted in the summaries at the end of each section, few of the policy statements have called for specific changes in public policy. Rather they have tended to provide understanding of various issues and to articulate broad goals for action. When specific government policy has been mentioned, the references tend to support action already undertaken by the government.

ALC social policy statements evidence a wide range in the quality of social analysis. The positions prepared by the Commission on Research and Social Action reflect a relatively keen insight into the nature of particular social problems. Those drafted by the Church Council or the General Convention contain considerably less analysis of problems, if any at all. Many of the statements in the area of family life and health are models of social analysis. This is due mainly to Reuss' professional background in the area. Issues in church and state rate very close to those in family life in the depth of understanding reflected in the analysis. Problems of economic and social life and of race relations also indicate a fairly high level of competent analysis. However, both areas indicate the need to involve in the drafting process persons who have special expertise in and acquaintance with the problems in those areas. The statement in race relations, for instance, affirm progressive goals, but lack an awareness of the specific problems in education, housing, employment, etc. International affairs' positions are least adequate with respect to an analysis of the problems, their causes and effects. The quality of analysis in these issues is only comparable to that which a casual reader of the newspaper might provide.

The basic reason for this wide range in the quality of social analysis in the statements can be traced to Reuss' authorship of most Commission positions. The problems which are closest to his particular area of competence reflect the most competent treatment. Improvement in the quality of analysis in other areas will be dependent upon the Commission's insistence that persons with special competence in those areas be involved in the drafting process.

This same weakness can be noted in the theological undergirding of the analysis and proposed action, again due to the church's failure to involve in the drafting process those persons with special competence in social ethics. While the use of proof-text, or reliance on particular Bible verses to establish a point of view has declined in the more recent period, increased theological competence will depend upon the involvement of persons with training in the area of social ethics.

Chapter X

THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH AND PUBLIC POLICY

This study has examined how the American Lutheran Church understands and exercises its political responsibility. It has focused on the activity of the ALC with respect to political action and to the political realism of its social policies and action. The study has portrayed the efforts of the ALC to influence public policy. It has considered the process by which the church arrives at its social policies, the attitudes of the ALC toward the forms and methods which it believes appropriate for the church in political action, and the political thought contained in its positions on public policy questions. The study attempted to determine the extent to which the ALC reflects a transformationist *vis-a-vis* a separationist stance with respect to church-state relations.

The thesis of the study was that inasmuch as any national religious organization must engage in political action in order to be relevant politically, the American Lutheran Church evidences on the basis of its political thought and action a low degree of political realism in spite of a gradually developing consciousness of responsibility for the social order, a consciousness which includes the intent to be relevant politically. That thesis has been supported by an examination of the role of the ALC in the American political process.

An examination of political action in the American Lutheran Church today leaves no doubt that it has rejected Lutheran "quietism," or a concern for the inner quality of life to the neglect of concern for the social order. This development stands in sharp contrast to much of the Lutheran tradition as described in Chapters III and IV of the study. Luther himself accepted responsibility for addressing the social ills of his day, but the voice of the Lutheran church became increasingly silent as the church became subservient to the rulers of government. "Quietism" has characterized much of the Lutheran past. Indeed, it is only since the Second World War that the Lutheran churches in this country have assumed increased responsibility for the social order. This emerging social consciousness began in the United Lutheran Church in America and in the Augustana Lutheran Church prior to the war. For those churches merging into the present American Lutheran Church in 1960, the broad awakening to responsibility for the social order followed the war. In the former American Lutheran Church, significant strides were made in the 1940's and 1950's. The three churches consolidating with the former American Lutheran Church--the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the Lutheran Free Church--had evidenced only a very weak awareness of social responsibility. Thus, it is no mean achievement that the American Lutheran Church today exhibits a strong social consciousness and accepts increased responsibility for public life.

Primary credit for the increased social responsibility manifested in the ALC must go to Carl Reuss, executive director of the church's Commission on Research and Social Action. Under his leadership beginning as executive secretary of the Board for Christian Social Action in the former American Lutheran Church, the ALC has come to recognize that the social problems of the nation as well as the institutional arrangements of American life are its proper concern alongside the strong concern it has always had for personal spiritual life. While questions may be raised as to the manner in which the ALC exercises this social responsibility and the degree of political realism in its efforts, the fact remains that the American Lutheran Church now accepts civic responsibility as a part of its regular work.

The avenue by which the ALC expresses its social responsibility is largely through "social education," the effort to make people sensitive to social problems in order to guide social change. Chapters V through VII revealed that the ALC consciously and purposely pursues social education as the primary expression of its social responsibility. Almost all of the efforts of the Commission on Research and Social Action, the unit of the church responsible for social, economic, and political matters, have been directed toward this end. The Commission's philosophy is that the social task of the church is to clarify the ethical dimensions of social problems and issues in order that members will be motivated to act on their own accord. The response of the American Lutheran Church to the national crisis in race, described in Chapter VII, reflected this basic approach.

The ALC is currently in the phase of social development through which most of the "mainline" Protestant churches passed in the 1930's and 1940's. As noted in Chapter II, that period was characterized by a growing awareness of social problems. Emphasis was placed on social education and moral persuasion leading to individual action. This moral idealism, the conviction that individuals will act and can correct social injustices if they are individually motivated to action through participation in the structures of secular society, now supports the social and political efforts of the ALC. The church has not yet entered into the phase of "social action" or direct efforts to change social, economic, and political conditions.

One reason in addition to the long period of Lutheran "quietism" why the ALC is only now experiencing the growth of social education stems from the differences in social awareness among the churches merging into the American Lutheran Church. The former American Lutheran Church moved into social education in the late 1940's and 1950's. The members of that body, to a considerable extent, have been marking time for the past ten years while the members of the other three churches came to accept the legitimacy of church responsibility for social problems. As noted in Chapter IV, the ALC is still behind the development attained by the former American Lutheran Church in certain respects such as the latter's specialized work in the area of economic life.

Up to the present time, the ALC has made only cautious overtures to social action. Chapters VI and VII noted the corporate involvement of the church in the 1963 "March on Washington" and in the commitment to Project Equality (although not implemented). It also indicated the efforts of the Division of Youth Activity along with the activities of Loren Halvorson and James Siefkes in the Divisions of College Education and Social Service, respectively, in the direction of social action. For the most part, however, the focus of the church is still upon the changing of attitudes rather than upon the advancing of structural changes. The orientation is to individual and personal action rather than to corporate and social action. The use of social and political power is viewed with suspicion. The expressed philosophy of the ALC with respect to the exercise of its social responsibility still denies the reality that corporate power rather than moral exhortation is required to overcome structural injustices. The response of the ALC to the national crisis, portrayed in Chapter VII, illustrates the singular focus on attitudes, to the neglect of the mobilization of corporate power in the struggle against urban ills and racial injustice. The lack of commitment on the part of the church to social action also is reflected in the fact that no national office of the ALC has been assigned responsibility for social justice.

The American Lutheran Church has made very few efforts to influence public policy directly. Most of the church's efforts, stemming from its commitment to social education, have related only indirectly to public policy. A number of the church's social policy statements have treated current political problems, but action upon the problems has largely been left up to the individual. Chapter VIII showed that a few direct contacts were made with congressmen, although most of these were limited to sending them selected policy statements. The ALC has been represented in Washington by the Office of Public Affairs of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., the inter-Lutheran cooperative agency, and as such has been a party to testimony at congressional hearings. But the ALC's Commission on Research and Social Action, as noted in Chapter V, has been reluctant to encourage the Lutheran Council to adopt more effective methods of political action. The ALC rejects the use of lobbying activities utilized by other private interest groups, including churches, which were outlined in Chapter II. At the same time the ALC has expressed its desire to be relevant politically.

Many of the reasons for the reluctance of the ALC to expand its corporate political activity are explained in Chapter V. The church's lack of political realism stems from a failure to recognize that social and political changes are brought about by adjustments in the distribution of power. The liberal conviction that moral appeals lead to social justice still casts its illusory shadow over the American Lutheran Church. This blind spot in the church's understanding of its political role is all the more remarkable for a church which theologically acknowledges the power of the demonic in life. The belief of the ALC

XUM

in moral responses to political needs and its understanding of sin do not correlate. Theologically, or ideologically, the Lutheran understanding of sin requires a political response of power realism. The continued moral appeals of the ALC's position, however, seem more attuned to the progressive idealism of the Social Gospel era, noted in Chapter II, than they do to the theology of the Reformation.

The development of social responsibility in the ALC did not receive guidance from the church's theologians. The professional background of Carl Reuss was sociology. The development of social consciousness in the church was not accompanied by a parallel development in its theology. Theological understanding in the ALC has remained focused on the individual spiritual life. While theological foundations were claimed for the growing social awareness, usually in the form of proof-texts, or the use of selected Bible verses to substantiate a claim, the real foundations for the expansion of social responsibility were borrowed from the liberal progressive thought which informed the pre-World War Two period, again as noted in Chapter II. The church did not supply the creative theological undergirding for the progressive social thinking of Reuss. Consequently, the ALC has not appreciated the resources of its theological tradition which call for, indeed require, political realism in social action. As noted in Chapter IV, the United Lutheran Church in America avoided this pitfall.

The hesitance of the American Lutheran Church to engage in political action also traces to its understanding of the "two kingdoms." As explained in Chapter III, the "two kingdoms" was a formula used by Luther as well as others before him to distinguish between God's rule through the gospel and his rule through law. This hermaneutical principle was transposed sociologically in later Lutheranism to differentiate between the church and the other institutions in society. The period of Lutheran "quietism" in effect affirmed that the church had no direct primary responsibility for public life. It appealed to this sociological definition of the "two kingdoms" to support its belief that the church must operate by moral persuasion alone. This understanding is now used to defend the commitment of the ALC to social education vis-a-vis social action and political activity.

Thus the church's theological understanding of its task helps define its political role. The "two kingdoms" principle, however, was never intended to be used as a sociological fence between church and state. The church and the other social institutions all operate under law. In any case, this basic misunderstanding has frustrated the development of political realism in the thought and action of the American Lutheran Church. Unfortunately, one of the handicaps of the Lutheran tradition has been a failure to develop a political ethic. Chapter III indicated some of the problems as well as the current debate over the development of such an ethic. Today the ALC struggles to define its political role without the assistance of an articulated ethic for political action.

This study also noted three other factors which have mitigated the advancement of effective political action in the ALC and affected its political realism. One factor has been the inadequate planning and review process by which strategy for social action is devised. Chapter VII, especially, traced the manner in which the objectives of the response of the ALC to the national crisis in race were never seriously considered. The strategy of Project Summer Hope, one of the main parts of that response, was adopted apart from a clear examination of the particular needs of the ALC and the program, once implemented, was never carefully evaluated. Chapter VIII showed a similar weakness with respect to the development of social policy statements. Secondly, Chapters VII through IX revealed that persons with expertise in political action and in the subject areas of proposed social policy statements have seldom been involved in the limited political action of the church or in the development of its social policy statements. Finally, Chapter VII noted the refusal of the office of the president to provide coordinating leadership to the efforts of the ALC in social education or social action.

In conclusion, the period of the 1960's has witnessed an acceptance by the American Lutheran Church of increased responsibility for the social order. The ALC has rejected the pattern of "quietism" in favor of conscious participation in public life. But the focus of the church upon social education and its reluctance to engage in social and political action, including lobbying, or direct efforts to influence public policy, have served to reduce its political realities implicit in Lutheran theology. The development of social consciousness has far outdistanced the development of theological foundations for political action in the ALC. The advance toward political action also has been slowed by a number of management weaknesses. Thus in spite of its intent to be relevant politically, the ALC evidences in its thought and action a low degree of political realism. While the ALC affirms the transformationist emphasis of the moral influence of the church upon the social and political order, it generally continues to operate according to the separationist emphasis upon the conversion of individuals and their individual responsibility to influence society and politics.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

SOCIAL POLICY STATEMENTS OF THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH, 1960-1969

XUM

XUM

TABLE 1: SOCIAL POLICY STATEMENTS OF THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH, 1960-1969

I	II(a)			III(b)		IV(c)	V(d)	VI(e)	VII(f)	VIII(g)	IX(h)
Social Policy Statement	Dates Approved			Status		Subject	Amended	Policy for ALC	Government Policy	Communicated to Government	Distribution
	A	B	C	A	B						
Abortion and the Law	4-69			x	2	3			2		12
Bargaining Power for Farmers	9-69			x	2	5					X
Black Manifesto, The		6-69		o	1	6		X			5
Change of National Election Days		6-63		o	1	4			1	1	
Christian Affirmation on Human Relations, A	(NLC) 9-61	10-61		o	1	6		X		2	245
Christian Social Action Through Public Witness	3-64			x	1	2		X			

XUM

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

I	II(a)			III(b)		IV(c)	V(d)	VI(e)	VII(f)	VIII(g)	IX(h)
	A	B	C	A	B						
Christians in Politics	3-66	6-66	1966	o	1	2	C				23
Church and Human Sexuality, The	3-66	6-66	1966	o	1	3	C G				40
Church as Employer, The	2-68	6-68	1968	o	1	1,5		X		2	14
Church-State Relations in the U.S.A.	4-64	6-64	1964 1966	o	1	4	C J	X		1,2	113
Church's Role in Combatting Communism, The	9-61	10-61		o	1	7		X			
Church's Role in Society, The	3-66	6-66	1966	x	2	1,2	C	X			75
Citizen Participation in Election Process			1968	o	1	2					
Commercialism in the Church	4-64	6-64	1964	o	1	1		X			147

XUM

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

I	II(a)			III(b)		IV(c)	V(d)	VI(e)	VII(f)	VIII(g)	IX(h)
	A	B	C	A	B						
Compulsory Attendance at Worship Services at Military Academies	(NLC)	JC 6-64	1964	o	1	4	G		1	1	
Conscientious Objectors		6-63		o	1	7			3		
Credit Unions and the Church	9-61	10-61		o	1	1,5		X			
Czechoslovakia			1968	o	1	7					
Death Penalty, The	4-69			x	2	5			2		10
Decision in a Time of National Crisis	10-68		1968	o	1	1,6	G	X		2	20
Diakonia: A Rationale for Christian Social Service	(SS) 5-66			o	1	1					3

XUM

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

I	II(a)			III(b)		IV(c)	V(d)	VI(e)	VII(f)	VIII(g)	IX(h)
	A	B	C	A	B						
Divorce for Theological Students and Pastors		10-61		o	1	3		X			
Effective Ministry in Intercultural Communities	12-63	6-64	1964	o	1	6		X			87
Endorsement of Kerner Commission Recommendations	6-68			x	1	6			2		
Endorsement of Lutheran Human Relations Assn. of America	3-64			x	1	6		X			
Enforcement of Non-Discrimination in ALC Congregations	(NLC)	2-63		o	1	6		X			
Equality of Opportunity --A Civil Right			1966	o	1	6			3	2	41

XUM

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

I	II(a)			III(b)		IV(c)	V(d)	VI(e)	VII(f)	VIII(g)	IX(h)
	A	B	C	A	B						
Exemption from Military Service for Divinity Students		6-68		o	1	4		X			
Federal Aid for Church Institutions		(JC) 10-62	1962	o	1	4		X		1,3	14
Grape Controversy, The	4-69	6-69		x	1	5	C		2		9
Hard Look at Our Task, A	3-62	7-62		x	1	1		X			175
Home Rule for the District of Columbia	4-67	6-67		x	1	2			2	2	51
Hunger in the World	6-68	6-68	1968	o	1	7	C		3	1,2	22
Income Tax Deductibility of Church Contributions		2-63 6-63		o	1	5			1	2	

XUM

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

I	II(a)			III(b)		IV(c)	V(d)	VI(e)	VII(f)	VIII(g)	IX(h)
	A	B	C	A	B						
Institutional Identification in Political Endorsements		6-68		o	1	1,2		X			
International Aid and Development			1968	o	1	7			1	1,2	
Interracial Contacts	(NLC)	6-64		o	1	6		X			
Interracial Marriage	2-68	6-68	1968	o	1	6		X		2	99
Minority Issues		6-69		o	1	6		X			5
National Crisis and the ALC, The		2-68		o	1	6		X			
Open Housing			1966	o	1	6				2	41
Open Membership Clause in Model Constitution		6-64		o	1	6		X			

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

I	II(a)			III(b)		IV(c)	V(d)	VI(e)	VII(f)	VIII(g)	IX(h)
	A	B	C	A	B						
Opposition to W.C.C. Statement on Cuban Crisis			1962	o	1	7				1	
Our Approach to Social Involvement	2-68	6-68	1968	x	1	1		X			96
Pastoral Counsel Concerning Voluntary Sterilization	3-63			x	1	3		X			
Pastoral Counsel to Selective Conscientious Objectors	10-68		1968	o	1	1,7		X			
Peace Corps (I)		10-61		o	1	4		X			
Peace Corps (II)	(NLC)	7-62	1962	o	1	5			2		
Peace Corps (III)			1968	o	1	5					

XUM

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

I	II(a)			III(b)		IV(c)	V(d)	VI(e)	VII(f)	VIII(g)	IX(h)
	A	B	C	A	B						
Prayer in the Public Schools			1964	x	1	4			1	3	168
Project Equality	2-68	6-68	1968	o	1	1,6		X		2	14
Public Authority, Dissent, and Civil Disobedience	4-69			x	2	1,2,5					60
Racism and Political Candidates			1968	o	1	2,6					
Religious Census		6-63		o	1	4			1	3	
Religious Faith as a Factor in American Elections	(NLC)	2-61		o	1	4					
Religious Test for Public Office	3-62				1	4					

XUM

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

I	II(a)			III(b)		IV(c)	V(d)	VI(e)	VII(f)	VIII(g)	IX(h)
	A	B	C	A	B						
Responsible Reproduction	12-66			x	1	3				1	22
Rural Economic Problems	9-69			x	2	5					X
Social Concerns Committee Endorsement			1968	o	1	1		X			
Social Concerns Committee in Model Constitution	12-67	6-68		o	1	1		X			
Social Security Coverage for Ministers	5-66	6-66	1966	o	1	4,5	C G		1	3	
State Use of Chaplaincy Services	(SS)	(JC) 6-68		o	1	4		X			
Statement on Priorities (Social Service)	(SS) 11-68			o	1	1		X			3
Sunday Closing Laws	12-63	6-64	1964	x	1	4	C				169

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

I	II(a)			III(b)		IV(c)	V(d)	VI(e)	VII(f)	VIII(g)	IX(h)
	A	B	C	A	B						
Support for President Kennedy in Cuban Crisis			1962	o	1	7			1	1	
Tax Reform: A Cause for Christian Action	9-69			x	2	5		X			X
Teachings and Practice on Marriage and Divorce	4-64	6-64	1964	o	1	3		X			133
Therapeutic Abortion		ECCC 1-63		o	1	3					
Traffic Safety	5-68	6-68	1968	x	1	5				1	57
Use of Hill-Burton Funds	(SS) 5-61			o	1	4		X			
U.S. Ratification of Human Rights Covenants	4-67	6-67		x	1	7			4		
Vietnam 1968	10-68		1968	x	1	7	G		3	1,2	25

XUM

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

I	II(a)			III(b)		IV(c)	V(d)	VI(e)	VII(f)	VIII(g)	IX(h)
	A	B	C	A	B						
Vietnam Involvement			1966	x	1	7			2	1,2	48
Violence in Television Programming	9-69	ECCC 10-69		x	2	5					X
War, Peace, and Freedom	3-66	6-66	1966	o	1	7	C G		1	1,2	55

(a) Column A indicates the dates on which the Commission on Research and Social Action approved policy statements. If a statement originated with a unit other than the Commission, that unit is noted in parenthesis. SS refers to the Board of Social Service NLC to the National Lutheran Council, and Pensions to the Board of Pensions. Column B indicates endorsement by the Church Council. In the few instances when the Joint Council acted instead of the Church Council, the letters JC are included in parenthesis. Action by the Executive Committee of the Church Council is indicated by ECCC. Column C shows General Convention action.

(b) Column A indicates whether a statement was "adopted" or "commended for study." O identifies adopted statements while X marks those commended for study. The check (✓) notes a statement best characterized as an opinion by the Commission on Research and Social Action. Column B separates "tentative" from "final" action on a statement. Number 1 identifies final statements and number 2 denotes those positions on which additional action is yet anticipated.

(c) Statements are classified in one or more of seven categories: 1--church and society, 2--citizenship and political rights, 3--family life and health, 4--church-state relations, 5--social and economic life, 6--race relations, and 7--international affairs. In certain cases a statement is placed in more than one subject area with the primary category underscored.

(d) This column shows the stages at which statements were amended. C refers to amendment by the Church Council, J by the Joint Council, and G by the General Convention. An underscored letter notes major amendment.

(e) Column VI identifies the social policy statements which determine policy for the operation of the ALC.

(f) The column on government policy indicates the statements which refer to government policy. Number 1 notes those positions which call upon a unit of government for specific action; number 2 shows that the position endorsed a particular policy goal; number 3 denotes statements which commend action which a unit of the government has already taken; number 4 refers to a request for ALC members to write government officials.

(g) This column indicates the social policy statements which have been communicated to a unit of government. Number 1 marks the statements communicated to an official or unit of the national administration, letter 2 notes statements sent to selected congressmen, and number 3 refers to statements used in congressional hearings.

(h) The final column shows the number, per thousand, of copies distributed to ALC members. An X is used to indicate recent statements which were about to be circulated at the time of this

XUM

tabulation. Except in two cases, figures were obtained from the Service Section of the ALC national offices on October 21, 1969. Statistics for "A Hard Look at Our Task" and "Statement on Priorities" were obtained on February 27, 1970.

XUM

TABLE 2

EDITORIALS AND FEATURE ARTICLES ON SOCIAL ISSUES APPEARING IN *THE LUTHERAN STANDARD*, 1961-1969

XUM

TABLE 2: EDITORIALS AND FEATURE ARTICLES ON SOCIAL ISSUES APPEARING IN THE LUTHERAN STANDARD, 1961-1969*

Year	I		II		III		IV		V		VI		VII		Totals	
	Church and Society		Citizenship and Political Rights		Family Life and Health		Church-State Relations		Social and Economic Life		Race Relations		International Affairs			
	E	F	E	F	E	F	E	F	E	F	E	F	E	F	E	F
1961	0	3	0	2	0	2	1	2	2	5	1	6	4	12	8	32
1962	0	2	3	5	1	0	1	2	1	7	2	4	0	7	8	27
1963	0	1	1	2	2	1	3	6	0	1	2	7	1	6	9	24
1964	1	0	2	10	2	3	1	0	1	2	2	4	4	0	13	19
1965	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	1	4	4	1	11	1	6	9	26

*Editorials (E) and feature articles (F) are classified in one of seven subject categories.

XUM

TABLE 2 (Cont'd.)

Year	I		II		III		IV		V		VI		VII		Totals	
	E	F	E	F	E	F	E	F	E	F	E	F	E	F	E	F
1966	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	0	2	4	15
1967	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	1	1	3	1	9	8	5	10	23
1968	2	0	3	0	3	1	0	0	4	6	5	19	0	3	17	29
1969	1	1	3	2	1	2	3	1	7	19	1	7	2	10	18	42
	5	8	13	30	10	11	9	13	20	51	19	73	20	51	96	237

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources of the American Lutheran Church and Its Predecessor Church Bodies

Reports of the General Conventions

Reports and Actions of the First General Convention of The American Lutheran Church, 1962. Minneapolis: American Lutheran Church, [1963].

Reports and Actions of the Second General Convention of The American Lutheran Church, 1964. Minneapolis: American Lutheran Church, [1965].

Reports and Actions of the Third General Convention of The American Lutheran Church, 1966. Minneapolis: American Lutheran Church, [1967].

Reports and Actions of the Fourth General Convention of The American Lutheran Church, 1968. Minneapolis: American Lutheran Church, [1969].

Minutes of Councils, Boards, Commissions, and Standing Committees

Board of The American Lutheran Church Men, July, 1959-August, 1969.

Board of The American Lutheran Church Women, July, 1959-August, 1969.

Board of American Missions, July, 1959-August, 1969.

Board of College Education, July, 1959-August, 1969.

Board of Luther League, July, 1959-August, 1969.

Board of Parish Education, July, 1959-August, 1969.

Board of Social Service, July, 1959-August, 1969.

Board of Theological Education, July, 1959-August, 1969.

XUM

Board of Trustees, July, 1959-August, 1969.

Board of World Missions, July, 1959-August, 1969.

Board of Youth Activity, July, 1959-August, 1969.

Church Council, 1960-69.

Commission on Evangelism, July, 1959-August, 1969.

Commission on Research and Social Action, July, 1959-January, 1970.

Joint Council, 1961-69.

Service to Military Personnel, September, 1960-August, 1969.

Minutes of Special Committees and Events

Conference on Inner City Ministries, 1968-69.

Coordinating Committee on National Crises, 1968-69.

President's Staff Advisory Coordinating Committee on the Urban Crisis, 1968.

Social Education Staff Group, 1968-69.

Periodicals of the Church

Arena One, 1967.

Commentator, 1961-69.

Edge, 1967-68.

Event, 1968-69.

Greater Works, 1961-68.

The Lutheran Standard, 1961-69.

ONE, 1961-65.

Scope, 1961-69.

Social Policy Statements

A. General Convention Statements

"Christians in Politics." *Reports and Actions, 1966*, pp. 487-89.

"The Church and Human Sexuality." *Reports and Actions, 1966*, pp. 489-92.

"The Church as Employer." *Reports and Actions, 1968*, pp. 473-75.

"Church-State Relations in the U.S.A." *Reports and Actions, 1964*, pp. 438-44.

"The Church's Role in Society." *Reports and Actions, 1966*, pp. 479-87.

"Citizen Participation in Election Process." *Reports and Actions, 1968*, pp. 35-36.

"Commercialism in the Church." *Reports and Actions, 1964*, pp. 444-47.

"Compulsory Attendance at Worship Services at Military Academies." *Reports and Actions, 1964*, pp. 678-80.

"Czechoslovakia." *Reports and Actions, 1968*, p. 40.

"Decision in a Time of National Crisis." *Reports and Actions, 1968*, pp. 489-97.

"Effective Ministry in Intercultural Communities." *Reports and Actions, 1964*, pp. 428-32.

"Equality of Opportunity--A Civil Right." *Reports and Actions, 1966*, pp. 40-41.

"Federal Aid for Church Institutions." *Reports and Actions, 1962*, pp. 584-88.

"Hunger in the World." *Reports and Actions, 1968*, pp. 478-80.

"International Aid and Development." *Reports and Actions, 1968*, pp. 39-40.

"Interracial Marriage." *Reports and Actions, 1968*, pp. 469-71.

"Open Housing." *Reports and Actions, 1966*, p. 42.

"Opposition to W.C.C. Statement on Cuban Crisis." *Reports and Actions, 1962*, p. 32.

"Our Approach to Social Involvement." *Reports and Actions, 1968*, pp. 463-65.

"Pastoral Counsel to Selective Conscientious Objectors." Reports and Actions, 1968, p. 486.

"Peace Corps" (II). Reports and Actions, 1962, pp. 577-78.

"Peace Corps" (III). Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 29-30.

"Prayer in the Public Schools." Reports and Actions, 1964, pp. 89-90.

"Project Equality." Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 471-73.

"Racism and Political Candidates." Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 40-41.

"Social Concerns Committee Endorsement." Reports and Actions, 1968, p. 399.

"Social Security Coverage for Ministers." Reports and Actions, 1966, pp. 465-66.

"Sunday Closing Laws." Reports and Actions, 1964, pp. 447-49.

"Support for President Kennedy in Cuban Crisis." Reports and Actions, 1962, p. 22.

"Teachings and Practice on Marriage and Divorce." Reports and Actions, 1964, pp. 432-38.

"Traffic Safety." Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 476-78.

"Vietnam 1968." Reports and Actions, 1968, pp. 481-84.

"Vietnam Involvement." Reports and Actions, 1966, pp. 43-45.

"War, Peace, and Freedom." Reports and Actions, 1966, pp. 492-501.

B. Church Council/Joint Council Statements

"The Black Manifesto." Minutes of the Church Council, June 23-25, 1969, pp. 36-37.

"Change of National Election Days." Minutes of the Church Council, June 28-29, 1963, p. 35.

"A Christian Affirmation on Human Relations." Minutes of the Church Council, October, 1961, p. 70.

"The Church's Role in Combatting Communism." Minutes of the Church Council, October 23-27, 1961, p. 68.

"Conscientious Objectors." Minutes of the Church Council, June 28-29, 1963, pp. 40-41.

"Credit Unions and the Church." Minutes of the Church Council, October 23-27, 1961, p. 67.

"Divorce for Theological Students." Minutes of the Church Council, October 23-27, 1967, pp. 48-49.

"Enforcement of Non-Discrimination in ALC Congregations." Minutes of the Church Council, February 17-18, 1963, pp. 16-18.

"Exemption from Military Service for Divinity Students." Minutes of the Church Council, June 24-26, 1968, p. 44.

"The Grape Controversy." Minutes of the Church Council, June 23-25, 1969, p. 30.

"A Hard Look at Our Task." Reports and Actions, 1962, pp. 355-56.

"Home Rule for the District of Columbia." Minutes of the Church Council, June 22-24, 26-27, 1967, p. 31.

"Income Tax Deductibility of Church Contributions." Minutes of the Church Council, June 28-29, 1963, p. 41.

"Institutional Identification in Political Endorsements." Minutes of the Church Council, June 24-26, 1968, p. 41.

"Interracial Contacts." Minutes of the Church Council, June 26-27, 30, July 1, 1964, pp. 4-5.

"Minority Issues." Minutes of the Church Council, June 25, 1969, pp. 48-49.

"The National Crisis and the ALC." Minutes of the Church Council, February 22, 1968, p. 11.

"Open Membership Clause in Model Constitution." Minutes of the Church Council, June 26-27, 30, July 1, 1964, p. 20.

"Peace Corps" (I). Minutes of the Church Council, October 23-27, 1961, pp. 51-52.

"Religious Census." Minutes of the Church Council, June 28-29, 1963, p. 66.

"Religious Faith as a Factor in American Elections." Minutes of the Church Council, February 7-9, 1961, p. 26.

"Social Concerns Committee in Model Constitution." Minutes of the Church Council, June 24-26, 1968, p. 48.

XUM

"State Use of Chaplaincy Services." Minutes of the Joint Council, June 27-29, 1968, pp. 36-37.

"Therapeutic Abortion." Minutes of the Church Council, February 17-18, 1963, p. 15.

"U. S. Ratification of Human Rights Convenants." Minutes of the Church Council, June 22-24, 26-27, 1963, pp. 31-32.

"Violence in Television Programming." Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Church Council, October 16-17, 1969, p. 26.

C. Statements by the Commission on Research and Social Action

"Abortion and the Law." Minutes, April 18-19, 1969. p. 3.

"Bargaining Power for Farmers." Minutes, September 12-13, 1969, p. 4.

"Christian Social Action Through Public Witness." Minutes, March 13-14, 1964, p. 7.

"The Death Penalty." Minutes, April 18-19, 1969, p. 3.

"Endorsement of Kerner Commission Recommendations." Minutes, June 17, 1968, p. 2.

"Endorsement of Lutheran Human Relations Association of America." Minutes, March 13-14, 1964, p. 7.

"Pastoral Counsel Concerning Voluntary Sterilization." Minutes, March 8-9, 1963, p. 4.

"Public Authority, Dissent, and Civil Disobedience." Minutes, April 18-19, 1969, p. 2.

"Religious Test for Public Office." Minutes, March 23, 1962, pp. 5-6.

"Responsible Reproduction." Minutes, December 5-6, 1966, p. 6.

"Rural Economic Problems." Minutes, September 12-13, 1969, p. 4.

"Tax Reform: A Cause for Christian Action." Minutes, September 12-13, 1969, p. 5.

XUM

D. Statements by the Board of Social Service

"Diakonia: A Rationale for Christian Social Service." Minutes, May 1-2, 1966, pp. 212-13.

"Statement on Priorities." Minutes, November 11-12, 1968, p. 285.

"Use of Hill-Burton Funds." Minutes, May 19-21, 1961, p. 80.

Study Reports and Guides by the Commission on Research and Social Action

Alpers, Kenneth P. *Bases for Lutheran Social Action* (1965).

Appointed Once to Die (1965).

Becker, Arthur H. *Making Ethical Judgments in a Changing World* (1966).

Church Fire Safety (1969).

Congregations Alert for Social Action (1963).

Graetz, Robert S. *A Congregational Guide for Human Relations* (1964).

Hefner, Philip. *Theological Perspectives on Social Ministry* (1968).

How Complex Are Our Issues! (1964).

Husfloen, Richard L. *Conflict and Its Creative Dynamics in Church and Society* (1968).

Kasberg, Lee Carolyn. *Time as a Trust* (1965).

________ and Carl F. Reuss. *Money Matters in the Christian Family* (1966).

Loddigs, Herbert G. *How to Understand Communism and Communists* (1962).

Reuss, Carl F. *Communism's Challenge to America and American Churches* (1961).

________. *Congregations, Communities, and "The War on Poverty"* (1965).

________. *The New Shape of the American Family* (1963).

________. *Signs for Safety* (1961).

XUM

________. *The Years of Our Life . . .* (1964).

________ *et al*. *Alcohol Problems--In Bits or As One?* (1968).

________ and Lee Carolyn Kasberg. *Unemployment* (1964).

________ and Edwin E. Olson. *The War on Poverty* (1964).

Schmid, Byron L. *Guide for the Social Concerns Committee* (1968).

________. *Racism, Power, and Authority* (1968).

________. *Resources for Social Concerns* (1969).

________. "Response of the ALC to the 1966 World Conference on Church and Society," mimeographed report, 1967.

Schmidt, Karl T. *Sexual Integrity in Modern Society* (1966).

Other Printed Materials of the American Lutheran Church

Agendas of the Commission on Research and Social Action, 1960-69.

Handbook of the American Lutheran Church. 1969 edition. [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1969].

Pastoral Letters of the President, 1961-69.

President's Messages to District Conventions, 1961-69.

Selected Reports and Memoranda, 1961-69.

Reports of the Conventions of the Churches Merging into the American Lutheran Church

Annual Report of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Minneapolis: Augsburg, biennially 1946-60.

Annual Report of the Lutheran Free Church. [Minneapolis: Messenger Press], annually 1930-62.

Official Report of the American Lutheran Church. Columbus: Wartburg, biennially 1946-60.

Yearbook of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church. Blair, Nebraska: Lutheran Publishing House, annually 1930-60.

Other Printed Materials of the Churches Merging Into the American Lutheran Church, the National Council, and the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A.

Board for Christian Social Action, American Lutheran Church. A Christian Approach to the Alcoholic Beverage Question (1960).

________. The Christian in His Social Living. [Columbus]: Board for Christian Social Action, 1960.

________. The Church Looks at Immorality in Print and on Screen (1959).

________. Your Congregation and Disaster Preparedness (1959).

Selected Statements and Memoranda of the National Lutheran Council and the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A.

Interviews

Mr. Albert E. Anderson, Assistant General Manager of Augsburg Publishing House, July 18, 1969.

Dr. George H. Berkheimer, Executive Director of the Board of Pensions, July 22, 1969.

Dr. Paul A. Boe, Executive Director of the Board of Social Service, October 2, 1969.

Dr. C. Richard Evenson, Executive Director of the Board of Parish Education, July 15, 1969.

Dr. Theodore P. Fricke, Executive Director of the Board of World Missions, July 17, 1969.

Mr. Raymond G. Johnson, Executive Director of the Board of Youth Activity, July 29, 1969.

Mr. W. Herbert Kent, Executive Director of the American Lutheran Church Men, July 15, 1969.

Dr. William Larsen, Executive Director of the Board of Theological Education, July 22, 1969.

Dr. R. Dale Lechleitner, Executive Director of the Board of American Mission, July 22, 1969.

Mr. Arnold R. Mickelson, Secretary of the American Lutheran Church, August 7, 1969.

Rev. Herbert Nottbohm, Assistant to the President of the American Lutheran Church, August 5, 1969.

Rev. David W. Preus, Vice-President of the American Lutheran Church, October 14, 1969.

Dr. Carl F. Reuss, Executive Director of the Commission on Research and Social Action, July 9, 1969.

Dr. George S. Schultz, Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees, July 24, 1969.

Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz, President of the American Lutheran Church, October 10, 1969.

Dr. Conrad M. Thompson, Executive Director of the Commission on Evangelism, July 22, 1969.

Dr. Robert Van Deusen, Director of the Washington Office of Public Affairs of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., October 28, 1969.

Dr. John Turnbull, Associate Director of the Washington Office of the National Council of Churches, October 27, 1969.

Other Selected Sources

Published Materials

Aulen, Gustav. This Is the Church. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1952.

Bainton, Roland. The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. Boston: Beacon, 1952.

Bennett, John C. Christian Ethics and Social Policy. New York: Scribners, 1946.

________. Christians and the State. New York: Scribners, 1958.

Bergendoff, Conrad. The Church of the Lutheran Reformation. St. Louis: Concordia, 1967.

Berggrav, Eivind. Man and State [1945]. Translated by George Aus. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1951.

XUM

Blaisdell, Donald. *American Democracy Under Pressure*. New York: Ronald Press, 1957.

Blanchard, Paul. *God and Man in Washington*. Boston: Beacon, 1960.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Ethics*. Translated by Neville Horton Smith and edited by Eberhard Bethge. New York: Macmillan, 1955.

The Book of Concord. Translated by Theodore Tappert. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1959.

Bornkamm, Heinrich. *The Christian Ethos*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1957.

________. *Luther's World of Thought*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1958.

"By Way of Introduction," *Social Progress* (July/August, 1967), 4-5.

Carlson, Edgar. *The Church and the Public Conscience*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1956.

________. "Luther's Conception of Government," *Church History*, XV (December, 1946), 257-70.

________. *The Reinterpretation of Luther*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1948.

________. "The Two Realms and the Modern World," *The Lutheran World*, XII (No. 4, 1965), 373-83.

Celler, Emanuel. "Pressure Groups in Congress," *The ANNALS of the Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCCXIX (September, 1958), 1-9.

Church and State: A Lutheran Perspective. New York: Board of Social Ministry, Lutheran Church in America, 1963.

Cranz, F. Edward. *An Essay on the Development of Luther's Thought on Justice, Law, and Society*. ("Harvard Theological Studies," Vol. XIX.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Dexter, Lewis Anthony. *How Organizations Are Represented in Washington*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969.

Dye, T. R. *Politics, Economics, and the Public*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Ebersole, Luke. *Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital*. New York: Macmillan, 1951.

XUM

Fevold, Eugene. *The Lutheran Free Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1969.

Forell, George. *Faith Active in Love*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1954.

Gable, Richard. "Interest Groups as Policy Shapers," *The ANNALS of the Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCCXIX (September, 1958), 84-93.

Geyer, Alan. *Piety and Politics*. Richmond: Knox, 1963.

Gibbons, Ray. "Processing a Pronouncement," *Social Action* (September, 1967), 6-9.

Glock, Charles, Benjamin Ringer, and Earl Babbie. *To Comfort and to Challenge: A Dilemma of the Contemporary Church*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Glock, Charles and Rodney Stark. *Religion and Society in Tension*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Grimm, Harold. *The Reformation Era, 1500-1650*. New York: Macmillan, 1954.

Hadden, Jeffrey. *The Gathering Storm in the Churches: The Widening Gap Between Clergy and Laymen*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1968.

Hall, George. "Church and State" in *What Lutherans Are Thinking*, edited by E. C. Fendt. Columbus: Wartburg, 1947.

Harland, Gordon. *The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Headley, John. *Luther's View of Church History*. New York: Yale University Press, 1963.

Hessel, Dieter. *Reconciliation and Conflict: Church Controversy Over Social Involvement*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.

Holtzman, Abraham. *Interest Groups and Lobbying*. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Hooft, Visser't and J. H. Oldham. *The Church and Its Function in Society*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1937.

Hopkins, Charles. *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.

XUM

Kennan, George. American Diplomacy, 1900-1950. New York: Mentor Books, 1951.

Key, V. O., Jr. Politics, Political Parties, and Pressure Groups. 5th edition. New York: Growell Press, 1964.

________. Public Opinion and American Democracy. New York: Knopf, 1961.

Lasswell, Harold. "The Public Interest: Proposing Principles of Content and Procedures" in The Public Interest, edited by Carl J. Friedrich ("Nomos," Vol. V). New York: Atherton, 1966.

Latham, Earl. The Group Basis of Politics. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Lau, Franz. "The Lutheran Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," The Lutheran World, XII (No. 4, 1965), 355-72.

Lazareth, William H. Luther on the Christian Home. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1960.

________. "The Twentieth Century Recovery of Lutheran Political Responsibility" in The Ethics of Power: The Interplay of Religion, Philosophy, and Politics, edited by Harold Lasswell and Harlan Cleveland. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

________. "The 'Two Kingdoms' Reconsidered," Dialog, I (Autumn, 1962), 30-35.

Lefever, Ernest. "The Protestant Nonpolitical Approach to Politics," The Christian Scholar, XXXVIII (June, 1955), 90-98.

Letts, Harold C., ed. Existence Today. ("Christian Social Responsibility," Vol. I.) Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1957.

________. Life in Community. ("Christian Social Responsibility," Vol. III.) Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1957.

________. The Lutheran Heritage. ("Christian Social Responsibility," Vol. II.) Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1957.

Lindblom, Charles. The Intelligence of Democracy. New York: Free Press, 1965.

________. The Policy Making Process. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Luther: Letters of Spiritual Counsel. Edited by Theodore Tappert. ("Library of Christian Classics," Vol. XVIII). London: SCM Press, 1955.

Luther, Martin. Admonition to Guard Against Revolution and Rebellion in Luther's Works. American edition. (Vol. XXXIV). Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1966.

________. Admonition to Peace in Luther's Works. American edition. (Vol. XXXVI). Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.

________. Exposition of the 82nd Psalm in Works of Martin Luther. Philadelphia edition. (Vol. IV). Philadelphia: Holman and Castle Press, 1931.

________. Lectures on Romans 13 in Wilhelm Pauck, Luther: Lectures on Romans. ("Library of Christian Classics," Vol. XV). Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.

________. An Open Letter on the Hard Book Against the Peasants in Luther's Works. American edition. (Vol. XXXVI). Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.

________. Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Ought to Be Obeyed in Luther's Works. American edition (Vol. XXXV). Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1962.

________. To the Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Reform of the Christian Estate in Luther's Works. American edition. (Vol. XXXIV). Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966.

________. Treatise on Good Works in Luther's Works. American edition. (Vol. XXXIV). Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966.

________. Two Kinds of Righteousness in Luther's Works. American edition. (Vol. XXXI). Philadelphia: Fortress, 1957.

________. Whether Soldiers, Too, Can Be Saved in Luther's Works. American edition. (Vol. XXXVI). Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.

May, Henry. Protestant Churches and Industrial America. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

McGovern, William. From Luther to Hitler. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1941.

McKean, Dayton. Party and Pressure Politics. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1949.

XUM

Meuser, Fred. The Formation of the American Lutheran Church. Columbus: Wartburg, 1958.

Meyer, Donald. The Protestant Search for Political Realism. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.

Milbrath, Lester. The Washington Lobbyists. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Miller, Robert M. American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958.

Monsen, R. Joseph, Jr., and Mark W. Cannon. The Makers of Public Policy: American Power Groups and Their Ideologies. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Morgan, Richard. The Politics of Religious Conflict. New York: Pegasus, 1968.

National Organizations of the United States. 5th ed. ("Encyclopedia of Associations," Vol. I.) Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1968.

Nelson, E. Clifford and E. L. Fevold. The Lutheran Church Among Norwegian-Americans. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1960.

Nichols, James. History of Christianity, 1650-1950. New York: Ronald Press, 1956.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. Christ and Culture. New York: Harper Torchbook, 1951.

________. The Kingdom of God in America. New York: Harper Torchbook, 1937, 1959.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness. New York: Scribners, 1944.

________. Christian Realism and Political Problems. New York: Scribners, 1953.

________. Christianity and Power Politics. New York: Scribners, 1940.

________. Moral Man and Immoral Society. New York: Scribners, 1932.

________. The Nature and Destiny of Man. 2 vols. New York: Scribners, 1949.

Nygren, Anders. "Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms," The Ecumenical Review, I (No. 3, 1949), 301-10.

Ramsey, Paul. Who Speaks for the Church? Nashville: Abingdon, 1967.

Pauck, Wilhelm. The Heritage of the Reformation. Rev. ed. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Rauschenbusch, Walter. Christianizing the Social Order. New York: Macmillan, 1912.

Pfeffer, Leo. Church, State, and Freedom. Rev. ed. Boston: Beacon, 1967.

"The Pre-Synod Study Process," Social Action (September, 1969), 43-46.

Sanders, Thomas. Protestant Concepts of Church and State. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1964.

Schneier, Edward, ed. Policy-Making in American Government. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Schriftgiesser, Karl. The Lobbyists: The Art and Business of Influencing Lawmakers. Boston: Little, Brown, 1951.

Scott, Andrew, and Margaret Hunt. Congress and Lobbies: Image and Reality. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965, 1966.

Sherman, Franklin. "Christian Love and Public Policy Today," The Lutheran Quarterly, XIII (August, 1961), 229-38.

Shinn, Roger. "Responses of Protestant Ethics to Political Challenges" in The Ethics of Power: The Interplay of Religion, Philosophy, and Politics, edited by Harold Lasswell and Harlan Cleveland. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

Shirer, William. The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich. Greenwich: Fawcett Crest, 1960.

Social Statements of the United Lutheran Church in America, 1918-1962. New York: Board of Social Missions, United Lutheran Church in America, c. 1962.

Stark, Rodney and Charles Block. American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Stedman, Murray, Jr. Religion and Politics in America. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1964.

Stokes, Anson Phelps, and Leo Pfeffer. Church and State in the United States. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Thielicke, Helmut. Theological Ethics. Translated by William H. Lazareth. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966, 1969.

Torrence, T. F. Kingdom and Church. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956.

Trillhaas, Wolfgang. "The Contributions of Lutheranism to Social Ethics Today" in Faith and Society: Toward a Contemporary Social Ethic, supplement to The Lutheran World, XIII (No. 2, 1966), 48-65.

Troeltsch, Ernst. The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches. Translated by Olive Wyon. (Vol. II.) New York: Harper Torchbook, 1931.

Truman, David. The Governmental Process. New York: Knopf, 1951.

United States Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, General Interim Report, 81st Cong., 2nd Sess., 1950.

Wentz, Abdel Ross. A Basic History of Lutheranism in America. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964.

Wentz, Frederick. Lutherans in Concert. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1968.

Whiting, Henry J. The Church's Speak: A Bibliography of Official Statements and Study Reports. New York: Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., 1969.

Wiener, Peter. Martin Luther: Hitler's Spiritual Ancestor. London: Hutchison, 1945.

Young, Ronald. American Law and Politics. New York: Harper Row, 1967.

Zeigler, Harmon. Interest Groups in American Society. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Unpublished Materials

Anderson, Robert. "The Awakening Social Consciousness of the American Lutheran Churches in America Since World War I: With Special Reference to the Augustana Lutheran Church." Unpublished S.T.M. thesis, Union Theological Seminary, 1959.

XUM

Geisler, Albert. "Official Pronouncements of the United Lutheran Church in America Relating to Certain Moral and Social Problems." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1941.

Growell, George. "American Cultural Values Obstructing Christian Social Action." Unpublished Th.D dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1966.

Haas, Harold. "The Social Thinking of the United Lutheran Church in America, 1918-1948." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Drew Theological Seminary of Drew University, 1953.

Kersten, Lawrence. "The Lutheran Ethic and Social Change." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, East Michigan University, 1968.

Klann, Herman. "Luther's Political Ethics: An Investigation of His Principles." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Columbia University, 1951.

Lentz, Harold. "History of the Social Gospel in the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in America, 1867-1918." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Yale University, 1943.

Miller, Robert Lee. "The Problem of Ethics in Contemporary American Politics." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Yale University, 1958.

Nash, James A. "Church Lobbying in the Federal Government: A Comparative Study of Four Church Agencies in Washington." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Boston University, 1967.

Svendsbye, Lloyd. "The History of a Developing Social Consciousness Among Lutherans in America From 1930 to 1960, With Reference to the American Lutheran Church, the Augustana Lutheran Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Lutheran Church in America." Unpublished Th.D dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1966.

Vines, Kenneth. "The Role of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in the Formation of American National Policy." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1953.

XUM

BIOGRAPHY

Byron Lee Schmid was born in Monroe, Wisconsin, on March 2, 1938. He graduated from Argyle High School, Argyle, Wisconsin, in 1956. He received the B.A. from Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minnesota, in 1960; the B.D. from the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, in 1963; and the M.A. from Duke University in 1967. He was a Lilly Fellow at Duke University.

In 1963-64 Mr. Schmid was employed by the Board of American Missions of the Lutheran Church in America. From 1967 to 1970 he was assistant director of the Commission for Research and Social Action in the American Lutheran Church. He is currently assistant professor of political science and consultant to the center for community and regional affairs at Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota.

XUM